

# **For Reference**

---

**NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM**

Ex libris  
UNIVERSITATIS  
ALBERTAENSIS











THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE ROLE OF THE FIELD CONSULTANT  
IN  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

by



WALTER COWLE

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE  
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1971



Thesis  
1971 E  
43

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "The Role of the Field Consultant in Elementary Schools" submitted by Walter Cowle in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.



## ABSTRACT

This study examined the role of the recently (1970) appointed elementary field consultant, with a view to determining the potential value of the position to a large urban elementary school district.

Thirteen sub-problems were posed covering the composite expectations of the role held by five different groups of in-school and central office personnel associated with it, and including those of the field consultant.

Data were collected from the central office and schools throughout the urban district, mainly by "forced choice" questionnaires sent to 10 central office personnel, 110 elementary school principals, 9 field consultants, 30 elementary coordinators and 210 elementary teachers. In addition, structured interviews were conducted with central office personnel and field consultants. Statistical treatment of data involved mainly frequency distribution and percentages.

Overall findings of the study indicate a high level of agreement between all five respondent groups on the functions of the field consultant and an increase in effectiveness of all consultative personnel in the schools, following the introduction of the field consultant position.

The majority of field consultants have encountered similar problems, but only a minority have experienced conflict situations with personnel in the schools. Field consultants and central office



personnel alike are generally agreed on specific improvements in the elementary school system that could further improve consultative services provided by field consultants. The improvements suggested include a larger allocation of time to field consultants for consultative work, better informed administrators on the consultative function and more attention by central office to the placement of field consultants.

The consensus of opinion between all respondents suggests that the role of the field consultant is basically one of helping teachers with classroom problems and of maintaining by in-service education a high standard of professional knowledge and competence in teachers.



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Grateful acknowledgments are due to Mr. H. Ward, elementary field consultants, central office personnel, principals, coordinators and teachers throughout the Edmonton Public School District, without whom this study could not have been possible.

The writer also wishes to express his sincere appreciation to his advisor, Dr. E.A. Holdaway, for suggesting the project, and for his generous assistance and forbearance at all times.

Thanks are also expressed to Mrs. C. Prokop for her assistance with computer programming and treatment of data.

To the Edmonton Public School Board thanks are expressed for financial assistance towards this study.

A debt of gratitude is owed to my wife and family for their unselfish tolerance of the study.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES .....	x
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW .....	1
THE PROBLEM .....	3
Statement of the Problem .....	3
Sub-problems .....	3
REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE .....	5
The Nature of Supervision .....	6
Role Expectations .....	9
The Consultant and His Function .....	10
Research into the Consultative Function of In-school Personnel .....	12
SUMMARY REMARKS .....	14
OVERVIEW OF THE THESIS .....	15
2. RESEARCH DESIGN .....	17
INSTRUMENTATION .....	18
Interviews with Field Consultants .....	19
Questionnaires of Personnel in the Schools .....	25
Central Office Questionnaire and Interview Report .....	26
COLLECTION OF DATA .....	26
The Sample .....	26
Method and Response .....	29
Characteristics of Respondents .....	31



Chapter		Page
	TREATMENT OF DATA .....	33
	SUMMARY .....	33
3.	A COMPARISON OF ROLE EXPECTATIONS BY DIFFERENT RESPONDENT GROUPS .....	34
	INTER-GROUP CONSENSUS .....	34
	Noncommittal Respondents .....	34
	Opinions of All Respondent Groups .....	40
	Classroom Personnel Experiences and Understanding of the Consultative Services Provided .....	47
	Career Prospects of a Consultative Position.	53
	PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND CONSENSUS .....	55
	Opinion in Relation to Age of Respondent ...	55
	Opinion in Relation to Experience of Respondent .....	58
	SUMMARY .....	60
4.	TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS OF ROLE .....	61
	INTRA-GROUP CONSENSUS .....	61
	Noncommittal Respondents .....	61
	Opinions in Relation to Consensus Between All Groups .....	62
	PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND CONSENSUS .....	62
	Opinions in Relation to Training of Teacher.	72
	Opinions in Relation to Grade Level Taught .	72
	Opinions in Relation to the Number of Subjects Taught .....	72



Chapter		Page
	Opinions in Relation to Sex of Teacher ...	73
	Opinions in Relation to "Self-Categorisation"	74
	SUMMARY .....	74
5.	IN-SCHOOL AND CENTRAL OFFICE CONSULTATIVE PERSONNEL EXPECTATIONS OF THE ROLE .....	75
	OPINIONS OF COORDINATORS ON THE FIELD CONSULTANT'S FUNCTION AND ROLE RELATIONSHIPS	75
	OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS ON THE FIELD CONSULTANT'S FUNCTION AND AN OVERVIEW OF ROLE RELATIONSHIPS IN THE SCHOOLS .....	78
	OPINIONS OF CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF ON THE FIELD CONSULTANT'S FUNCTION AND AN OVERVIEW OF CONSULTATIVE SERVICES PROVIDED .....	81
	Opinions of Central Office on the Field Consultant's Function .....	81
	Opinions of Central Office Relating to Suggested Improvements on the Field Consultant's Function .....	81
	SUMMARY .....	88
6.	THE FIELD CONSULTANT'S EXPERIENCES IN THE ROLE	89
	INTRA-GROUP CONSENSUS .....	89
	On Function .....	89
	On Problems Encountered .....	90
	On Improvements Necessary to Increase Effectiveness .....	92
	Career Satisfaction and Monetary Allowances	94
	SUMMARY .....	94
7.	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, AND CONCLUSIONS .....	96
	RESTATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM .....	96



Chapter		Page
	SUMMARY FINDINGS .....	96
	CONCLUSIONS .....	104
	The Role of the Field Consultant .....	104
	The Overall Value of the Field Consultant to the Urban Elementary School District .....	106
	The Improvements Necessary To Solve the More Immediate Problems Encountered by Field Consultants .....	107
	SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH .....	108
BIBLIOGRAPHY	.....	109
APPENDIX A	Outline of Instrument for Structured Interviews with Elementary Field Consultants .....	112
APPENDIX B	Instruments for Collecting data .....	116
APPENDIX C	School and Central Office Personnel Responses on the Functions of the Elementary Field Consultant .....	158
APPENDIX D	Specimen Computer Print-Out .....	171



# LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Duties of the Field Consultants Taken from Interview Responses .....	20
2.	The Expectations of the Field Consultant Taken from Interview Responses .....	21
3.	The Problems Encountered by the Field Consultant Taken from Interview Responses .....	22
4.	Suggested Improvements to the School System by Field Consultants Taken from Interview Responses .....	23
5.	Experiences of the Field Consultants in Working With the Coordinators Taken from Interview Responses .....	24
6.	Number and Characteristics of the Selected Schools .....	28
7.	Number of Questionnaires Distributed and Returned .....	30
8.	Characteristics of All In-School Respondents ..	32
9.	Percentages of "No Opinion" and "Undecided" Responses Obtained from All Groups .....	35
10.	Collapsed Agreement Responses on the Functions of the Elementary Field Consultant Excluding Noncommittal Responses .....	41
11.	Differences of Opinion on the Consultative Functions between Respondent Groups .....	46
12.	Estimated Number of Teachers and Schools Visited by the Nine Field Consultants during the School Year 1970-71 .....	48
13.	Classroom Personnel Experiences of the Consultative Services Provided .....	51
14.	Classroom Personnel Understanding of the Role of the Field Consultant .....	52



Table		Page
15.	Opinions of Personnel in Schools on Consultation as a Career Position .....	54
16.	Preferences of Personnel in Schools for Field Consultant Position over Principalship .....	54
17.	Agreement Responses for Different Age Categories of All In-school Respondents .....	57
18.	Agreement Responses for Different Experience Categories for All In-School Respondents ....	59
19.	Comparison of Teacher Responses for Different Numbers of Years of Training .....	63
20.	A Comparison in Teacher Responses for Different Grade Levels Taught .....	65
21.	A Comparison in Teacher Responses for Different Numbers of Subjects Taught .....	67
22.	Male and Female Teacher Responses on the Functions of the Elementary Field Consultant.	69
23.	Comparison of Agreement Responses by "Generalist" and "Specialist" Teachers .....	70
24.	Responses of Coordinators on the Functions of the Field Consultant With a Direct Relationship to Their Role .....	77
25.	Experiences of the Principals of the Consultative Services Provided .....	79
26.	The Principals' Understanding of the Field Consultant's Role .....	80
27.	Summary of Interview Responses by Central Office Personnel on Specific Items .....	83
28.	Group Opinion on Problems Encountered by Field Consultants .....	91
29.	Improvements Suggested by Field Consultants To Increase Their Effectiveness .....	93
30.	Responses by School and Central Office Personnel on the Functions which Elementary Field Consultants Can Perform .....	159



## Chapter 1

### INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Large school districts like the one involved in the study, with complex supervisory organizations, are moving in the direction of decentralising some of their staff and simplifying their organization. As a result of a rapid expansion in the past decade, demands for supervisory services in the urban system have increased and modification of staff functions have become imperative.

The purpose of the study was to examine the recently established position of field consultant with a view to determining its potential value to a large urban school district.

Throughout all the 110 elementary schools in the district investigated, central office staff have endeavoured in 1970-71 to provide more "supervisory assistance in the field" as part of an improved consultative service to teachers. Finlay (1970:1) refers to a "team of capable teachers" appointed and designated elementary field consultants. They are without administrative duties and their work has no bearing on teacher rating or "hiring and firing."

The field consultant's role can have many facets, including assistance to a young teacher just starting in the profession, as well as helping to provide the contributive conditions in the classroom for the in-service development of more experienced teachers. The work with teachers is usually at the teachers' request, to help them do successfully the things they want to do.



Field consultants are working increasingly at the request of school staffs in identifying problems or needed lines of development. Sometimes they work with larger groups from various surrounding elementary schools in workshops or co-operative planning.

The particular characteristics of the work of the field consultant which may contribute to the success of this newly created position are the following.

1. Those selected are creative, competent classroom teachers who have demonstrated respect for their colleagues and have some facility in working successfully with them.
2. Their work is limited to the essential business of helping to provide the conditions for good teaching and learning.
3. The field consultants do not have authority to make teachers or schools do things; they succeed only as people learn to like and trust them and find them truly useful.
4. The assistance of the field consultant can be more acceptable to classroom teachers than that of any central office personnel because they are known to be practising classroom teachers and less likely to carry out any formal evaluations.

In spite of the simplicity of function and the democratic nature of emerging supervisory roles, like that of the consultant



outlined in the literature by Enns (1968:283-297) and envisaged by the urban school board, some ambiguity continues to surround the title of any supervisory position. Nevertheless, certain trends of this connection may be noted as follows.

1. Persons occupying supervisory roles tend to serve in "staff" rather than "line" positions.
2. Titles which connote helping, supporting, coordinating functions are being used increasingly.
3. Through studies of roles and written job descriptions, effort is being made to clarify the roles of various supervisory personnel.
4. New supervisory positions with new functions and titles are being established.
5. Titles are tending to be more descriptive of functions and are compatible with current trends in working relationships.

### THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem. What are the opinions held by teachers, coordinators, field consultants, principals and central office staff regarding the professional assistance which field consultants are expected to provide in helping teachers to improve their classroom instruction?

#### Sub-problems

1. To what extent are teachers and other alter groups familiar with the consultative functions of the field consultant?



2. What consensus is there between all five respondent groups concerning the functions of the field consultant?
3. What are the differences in expectations for field consultants between the different alter groups?
4. What consultative services do field consultants consider they should provide?
5. Are there any apparent overall differences in the responses of all respondents on the bases of age and experience?
6. Are there significant differences in the responses given by teachers categorised on these bases?
  - (a) teaching level
  - (b) years of training
  - (c) number of subjects taught
  - (d) sex of teacher
  - (e) "generalist" or "specialist"
7. What kind of co-operation is expected and experienced between coordinators and field consultants?
8. What kind of co-operation is expected and experienced between principals and field consultants?
9. What are the problems encountered by field consultants in their new role?
10. What changes are necessary in the elementary school system to improve the effectiveness of the field consultant?
11. How do central office staff view the effectiveness of the consultative services provided by field consultants at the elementary level?



12. What are the career prospects of the field consultant position?
13. What specific criteria are used in selecting field consultants?

#### REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

According to Neagley and Evans (1970:2), supervision is a "comparative newcomer" among the educational occupations, since it only became an integral part of the educational system in the latter half of the nineteenth century. As a function it has evolved through a number of stages, including the inspectorial, the supervisory, and presently the consultative phase.

The consultative point of view as described by Blessing (1968:2) has evolved as a result of a number of educational developments, such as more competently trained or professional teaching personnel, newer concepts of child development and greater recognition that the supervisor's role is not perceived by teachers as it has been perceived by supervisors themselves.

Some contemporary opinions on supervision in education, especially in regard to its consultative aspects are presented under the following headings: (1) The Nature of Supervision, (2) Role Expectations, (3) The Consultant and His Function, (4) Research into the Consultative Function of In-school Personnel, (5) Summary Remarks.



### The Nature of Supervision

Enns (1968:5) and many other writers point out that supervision consists of a highly complex set of behaviors requiring special skills, understandings and knowledge, but it is one of the functions that is essential to any effective or efficient school operation.

Enns (1963:28) and Spears (1959:85) see the major purpose of supervision as the maintenance and improvement of instruction. Viewing supervision within the framework developed by Harris (1963:Chap. 1) provides a basis for its conceptualisation or reconceptualisation, for everyone has a conception of supervision no matter how ill-defined or unsophisticated it may be. Accepting the notion that supervising is a form of "teaching" is the first step. It is the function upon which a useful concept may be constructed.

Speaking broadly, Frymier (1965:83-102) suggests supervision is undertaken for the purpose of helping classroom teachers grow professionally. Harris (1963:Chap. 1) concurs, but emphasizes that it is directly instruction-related and indirectly pupil-related. Further, he envisions a whole continuum of operation ranging from extremely tractive (resistant to change) to extremely dynamic (innovative) in the orientations of its various activities with no two supervisory situations alike. Harris (1963:Chap. 1) also intimates that it is impossible to determine precisely where supervision ceases and teaching begins, and the hallmark of an



effective supervisor is his ability to adapt to changes in situations. Each newcomer to any group alters its orientations, each concept learned creates a different situation, and each time attention is shifted from one goal to another the circumstances are changed.

Among other factors, according to Harris, that must be taken into account are expectations, perceptions, abilities, tasks, processes, skills, understandings, support and time. Although there may be other important factors that help establish the dimensions and structure of any adequate teaching situation, a consideration of those presented points up the fact that effective supervising--that which produces competent, effective teachers--cannot be a routine series of actions mechanically repeated over and over. It is presumably a shared function or process carried out by two or more professional persons, each making his own distinctive contribution to the task.

Both MacKay (1969:13) and Freeze (1970:354) point out that no well developed theory of supervision has been worked out or even a framework upon which an adequate program of research could be built. The latter writer does, however, refer to the numerous factors hypothesised in the research literature on supervision when he (Freeze, 1970:354) says:

These include intelligence, knowledge of subject matter, professional knowledge, personality, experience, attitude and many others.



Freeze (1970:354) further concludes:

Examination of the relations between these variables and success has yielded little of practical value. It is believed that supervisors represent a group of people above average in knowledge and intelligence: thus, it is not surprising that significant correlations have not been demonstrated between these variables and various criteria of the improvement of instruction. Thus is witnessed a profession with little objective data to support selection and preparation programs for new members of the profession.

In spite of the literature not elucidating the question "what is effective supervision?", some concepts which may be drawn from the preceding discussion, and upon which this investigation is based, are outlined by Burnham and King (1961).

1. Instructional supervision is a dynamic, growing process that is occupying an increasingly important role in the schools.
2. The purpose of supervision is to offer leadership in the improvement of educational experience for children and youth.
3. Leadership is centred on a group, not on an individual.
4. The type and quality of supervision are affected by the situation, the organization, in which the supervision exists.
5. The climate of human relationships within the group and the degree to which members are committed to group goals influence the degree of change in practice.
6. The way in which individuals perceive the problems and the tasks inherent in the situation affects their behavior.



7. The actual role of supervision - and of instructional leaders - is a composite of all expectations held for the role by the people associated with it.
8. A primary goal of supervisory leaders is to foster leadership in others.

### Role Expectations

A supervisor's perception of a situation and of leadership will cause him to hold certain expectations of his role. These expectations according to role theorists, like Sarbin (1954:225) make up the actual role. Simpkins and Friesen (1969:13-19) view leadership as a "process" and this is entirely compatible with Corwin's (1965:73) growing "professionalism" of teachers and the present trend in supervisory practices outlined by Frymier (1965: 83-102). It is certain, however, that all of those associated with the leadership role will not view the position in the same way; each will hold his own expectations for the leadership function. According to Owens (1970:71-3), when the holder of a position cannot conform to all expectations or establish reciprocal role relationships, he is described as holding a position of role conflict.

Conflicting role expectations may result in a supervisor being perceived as ineffective by those with whom he is working. Ferneau (1954:8) investigated the effectiveness of consultative services of state department officials as perceived by local school



officials. He found that a consultant may behave as an "expert," a "process person," or a "resource person," and be considered effective by some people in some situations. However, the consultative service was rated most successful by both the local school official and the visiting consultant when they perceived the role of consultant in the same way.

### The Consultant and His Function

Consultation according to MacKay (1969:9) is one of the supervisor's activities as an expert in general or special education. Enns (1968:288) regards it as one of four major functions (motivation, program development, consultation and evaluation) of supervision and says:

The function of helping teachers to maintain professional knowledge and competence is the consultation function. Consultation may involve individuals or groups. It may involve the services of a consultant, or it may consist of the individual learning from printed materials. In short, it is the function of increasing the teacher's knowledge either generally or specifically, serving to bring the individual to an acceptable level of knowledge or helping him to keep abreast once he has reached that level. This is the function commonly subsumed under the heading in-service education.

Lucio and McNeil (1969:21-47) suggest a person employed under the title of "consultant" in one setting may be known by various other titles in other settings, such as supervisor, advisor, coordinator or master teacher. He is often perceived to be in a "helping relationship" to individuals on such matters as in-service and curriculum committees. The term is applied, also, to persons who come from outside the system to serve school



boards or particular schools. The term is being used increasingly to denote service in special fields or at specified levels; for example, consultant in elementary education, consultant in secondary education, science consultant or curriculum consultant.

Whatever the variables found in the literature concerning the title, setting or role of the "consultant," practically all references assume that any person in a consultative position possesses special knowledge, skills and understandings that can be used by groups working on instructional programs.

When reference is made to the consultant specifically as a resource person or specialist in subject-matter areas or in special education, questions are often raised in regard to the supervisory nature of the role. Arguments for and against assigning only a specialist advisory role to that of a consultant are given by Neagley and Evans (1970:135-136).

Advantages:

1. The concept of the completely self-contained classroom and autonomy for the teacher is preserved.
2. Flexible scheduling of the special subject areas is possible because it is completely under the control of the regular classroom teacher.
3. Expert assistance is available "on call" at all times.
4. The most economical use can be made of the time and talents of the specialist, because he can devote the bulk of his energy to assisting teachers who need the most help.



Disadvantages:

1. Some teachers do not recognize that they need help in the special areas and, consequently do not ask for help.
2. Complete utilization of the services of the consultant is rarely accomplished. This is particularly true in the early stages of this arrangement.
3. The special areas may be neglected by teachers who do not consider them important and who have no desire to improve in teaching them.
4. Some teachers may monopolise the services of the specialists and thus make them unavailable for other teachers.
5. The specialists are not always available when they are needed; for example, several teachers might require the help of the same subject consultant at the same time.

Research into the Consultative Function of In-school Personnel

Few studies have focused directly upon the consultative function. This present study of elementary field consultants appears to be one of very few which attempts to do so.

As MacKay (1971:3) points out, supervisors have been traditionally involved in the functions of consultation, but distinction between consultation and supervision is difficult to maintain. This dilemma is reflected in the findings of Harrison (1965) and Toews (1970), when they tried to isolate the



behavior that was crucial in determining success or failure of the principal's administrative role.

The role of the junior high school coordinator was examined in detail by Hewko (1965). The school system which he used was the same as that used by this study. He reviewed some of the changing concepts of school supervision in terms suggested by Andrews (1960), namely that program development, evaluation and motivation were provided by central office personnel and principals. Hewko concluded that consultation in specific subjects should be the province of the coordinator. He surveyed the perceptions of the role of the coordinators as held by central office and all in-school personnel, after the role had been established for four years. Many of the functions of the coordinator suggested were very similar to the ones given in interview responses (see Chapter 2) by elementary field consultants in regard to their role. Hewko concluded that coordinators should (a) encourage teacher experimentation, (b) liaise between teachers and central office, (c) develop course outlines for new teachers, (d) assist teachers in selecting aids, references and ensuring the availability of materials, (e) organise in-service training programs, (f) visit classrooms on invitation only, (g) give demonstration lessons, and (h) should not give direct counselling or evaluate teachers. Hewko concluded that consultation and not coordination is the coordinator's main function.

Further examination of the coordinator's role in an urban system was undertaken by Heron (1969). His findings in contrast to



Hewko's showed an almost complete lack of congruence between expectations of teachers and coordinators for the functions of the coordinators.

#### SUMMARY REMARKS

New concepts on the supervisory or consultative function in education are being formulated and titles for supervisory personnel are changing, but any person who is a holder of a new supervisory position, as well as many persons with whom he is associated, may well ask such questions as the following: What is the supervisor supposed to do? What is the supervisor's authority? How does the supervisor initiate activities? What is the supervisor's relationships with other school personnel?

There is growing concern for avoiding some of the unpleasant connotations that surround the word "supervisor" and the questions posed are illustrative of the ambiguities and misunderstandings that continue to surround the supervisory role.

The supervisor's or consultant's role in a school system is a composite of all the expectations held by the people associated with the role, including the incumbent. The establishment of good working relationships are primarily dependent upon the kind of expectations held by the people with whom he works and on how similar these are to his own expectations.



## OVERVIEW OF THE THESIS

This study of the role of the elementary field consultant consists of seven chapters. In this chapter the writer has attempted through a literary review, to delineate the consultative function as well as indicate the purpose of the study.

The design of the study is outlined in Chapter 2. It consists of a description of the "forced choice" questionnaire and interview techniques used to obtain data, the sample, the collection and organisation of the data, the returns and the analysis of the data.

Chapter 3 provides opinions from all five respondent groups on the functions and career aspects of the elementary field consultant position. Opinions in relation to the different personal characteristics of the respondents are also considered.

Comparisons are made in Chapter 4 between the teachers' expectations of the field consultant role and the expectations of other respondent groups. In addition, teachers expectations are analysed on the basis of teaching level, teaching experience, years of training, number of subjects taught and self-categorisation.

In Chapter 5 role relationships between the elementary field consultant and other in-school consultative personnel are examined, as well as including a central office overview of the consultant's function.

The opinions of elementary field consultants regarding their function, the major problems encountered and the improvements



necessary to their position, are discussed in Chapter 6.

Chapter 7 concludes the thesis with a restatement of the problem, a summary of the findings, an outline of the role of the field consultant and a suggestion for further research.



## Chapter 2

### RESEARCH DESIGN

The role of the nine elementary field consultants in the urban school district had not previously been investigated. A significant question seems to be whether or not the position of field consultant, with the primary function of helping teachers with classroom problems, is making a significant contribution to the overall effectiveness of the total elementary school organization.

The study was basically an attempt to clarify the elementary field consultant's role by comparing the perceptions given by central office personnel, principals, field consultants, coordinators and teachers. In addition, the effect of this role on more established roles of other in-service staff was examined, as were the career alternatives afforded by the newly created position.

#### Delimitations

The study was confined to 110 elementary schools in one school district. It surveyed samples of the following:

1. Central office personnel (assistant superintendent, directors and special subject supervisors).
2. All field consultants.
3. Teachers from all elementary grade levels and specialties.



4. Teachers and principals from schools of different sizes.
5. Teachers and principals from different types of schools (e.g. open area and traditional).
6. Teachers and principals from schools in different localities (e.g. inner city and suburbs).
7. Coordinators from all geographic zones in the district.

### Limitations

The study was limited to nine field consultants working in only six subject areas. Three basic assumptions were made:

1. Questionnaire items derived from the interview responses of the field consultants reflect all major aspects of their intended role.
2. All categories of respondents were expected to have sufficient first-hand experience of field consultants or awareness of their classroom needs to express valid opinions about the consultant's role.
3. The concept of role has relational specifications as described by Gross, Mason and McEachern (1966:61).

Non-incumbents together with incumbents of the position of field consultant are the definers of the role.

### INSTRUMENTATION

To obtain information on the perceptions, beliefs, feelings and future aspirations of various in-school and central office



personnel, reliance was primarily placed on questionnaire responses and to a limited extent on categorised views expressed in structured interviews.

#### Interviews with Elementary Field Consultants

Permission was obtained from the school district to conduct structured interviews (Appendix A) with all consultants in their nine resident schools. The categorised interview responses shown in Tables 1 - 5 were used to develop questionnaires appropriate to five different respondent groups in the schools and central office.



Table 1

Duties of the Field Consultants  
Taken from Interview Responses

Duty	Order of Importance Suggested by Field Consultants
Non-directive counselling Disseminating new materials Planning workshops and seminars Developing creativity in the classroom Advising coordinators Acknowledging teacher recommendations	Very Important
Assisting newly appointed teachers Interpreting school board policy	Important
Directive counselling	Somewhat Important
Visiting all teachers twice yearly	Not Important



Table 2  
The Expectations of the Field Consultant  
Taken from Interview Responses

---

---

By Central Office

A regular report at or to the office on teacher needs and activities (log-book) in the schools.

Organize workshops and instructional materials.

Edit curriculum materials.

Lessen the workload of central office staff (e.g. principals often referred by central office to the field consultant).

Give advice, when called directly or indirectly, to principals, coordinators and teachers.

Evaluate innovations in the classroom.

Initiate changes/innovation in the classroom, i.e. cause some breakdown of the "traditional" approaches.

Liaison between central office and the schools.

By Principals

Often none - many not familiar with the field consultant function.

Inservice work - in staff meetings, workshops and seminars.

Help for individual teachers with materials, in methodology, in motivation and with physical facilities.

Organize programs for teachers.

By Teachers

Directive help (often) - ideas, procedures, lesson preparations, visual aids and texts.

Assistance in compiling a curriculum.

Explanation of central office policies, e.g. from specialist committees, directives and programs of studies.

Give helpful suggestions - especially for newly appointed teachers.

---

---



Table 3

The Problems Encountered by the Field Consultant  
Taken from Interview Responses

---

Total lack of facilities for consultative work in terms of keeping records, preparatory work, adequate storage and access to a telephone.

Insufficient time for clerical work, follow-up work and building-up programs.

No clerical assistance.

Role conflict (dual loyalties) - teaching versus consultative duties.

Inflexibility of timetabling - consultative work only in the afternoon.

Students of own class often at a disadvantage.

Conflict with principal in the resident school.

Mistrust of field consultants by teachers.

Coordinators not sufficiently trained for the whole area of their responsibility.

Teachers too generalist in their approach.

Imbalance of consultative duties - too much in-service work compared with classroom visitations.

---



Table 4

Suggestions by Field Consultants Concerning Improvements  
to the School System Taken from Interview Responses

---

More attention by central office to the placement of field consultants in the schools in terms of adequate facilities, attitude to resident administrator, the teacher co-operating with the consultant in the teaching situation, availability to secretarial help, and "centralization" of the consultant.

School administrators should be better informed of the field consultant's function.

Change in attitude of teachers - make them aware that field consultants are not evaluators.

More opportunity to develop the specialist interests of teachers.

More opportunity for all consultants to meet together, e.g. an "ideas fair."

More flexible timetabling and time for consultative work.

More specific allotments of time per subject to joint-subject coordinators.

More opportunity to build "lighthouse" classrooms.

More involvement in central office decision-making.

---



Table 5

Experiences of the Field Consultants  
in Working with the Coordinators  
Taken from Interview Responses

---

Not all field consultants had coordinators working in their subject areas\*, but where co-operation was required between the two, it was generally quite satisfactory except for instances of the following:

1. A disproportionate amount of time was spent on one subject by the joint-subject coordinators.\*\*
2. An inadequacy of training of the joint-subject coordinators in one subject area.
3. A lack of time and timetabling conflicts prevented more contact between the consultant and the coordinator.
4. An ambiguity of coordinator and consultant roles especially where consultants were not working directly with coordinators.
5. A lack of "urgency" shown by some coordinators.

---

\* Art subject coordinators did not teach in the schools.

\*\* All coordinators at the elementary level were responsible for assisting teachers in the classroom in two subjects, (e.g. mathematics and science).



### Questionnaires of Personnel in the Schools (Appendix B)

A separate questionnaire was prepared for each category of personnel in the schools, namely: principals, field consultants, coordinators and teachers. To each respondent group was sent a six-point "forced choice" questionnaire, providing the respondent with an opportunity to express varying degrees of agreement-disagreement or noncommittal responses. Inclusion of two noncommittal response categories ("undecided" and "no opinion") was considered important especially in view of the uniqueness of the consultative position investigated and the short time since its inception.

Thirty-four questions on the elementary field consultant's function were common to all four questionnaires, and uniformity from one test situation to another was attempted by standardising the questions and instructions.

In addition to covering the various aspects of the consultative function, personal data and career aspects on all questionnaires, certain other questions in different questionnaires were asked as follows.

#### 1. The Principals' Questionnaire.

Two sections of thirteen questions related to the co-operation and relationship between field consultants and principals.

#### 2. The Field Consultants' Questionnaire.

Two sections of thirty questions concerned a range of categorised problems encountered and improvements suggested



by the field consultants.

### 3. The Coordinators' Questionnaire.

An extra nine questions on the field consultant's function were included which bear a direct relationship to the function of the coordinator.

#### Central Office Questionnaire and Interview Report (Appendix B)

One section consisted of thirty-four questions on the field consultant's function common to all questionnaires of personnel in schools. Another section presented question outlines for a structured interview report that required comments and suggestions from the various central office personnel.

## COLLECTION OF DATA

### The Sample

The study involved all principals, coordinators, field consultants and 210 teachers employed in the elementary schools of the district, as well as all central office personnel having a direct working relationship with field consultants.

The following criteria were used in selecting the twelve schools that contained the teacher sample population shown in Table 6.

1. Four school size categories were equally represented, namely:

Schools with up to 10 teachers

Schools with 11-16 teachers



Schools with 16-20 teachers

Schools with over 20 teachers

2. The schools were well distributed throughout the district.

3. The sample contained schools with and without a resident field consultant.



Table 6

## Number and Characteristics of the Selected Schools

Code No. of School	Locality	No. of Teachers
1	City Centre	14
2	Urban	7
3	Urban	32
4	Urban	8
5	Urban	31
6	Urban	9
7	Urban	16
8	City Centre	18
9	Urban	15
10	Urban	12
11	Urban	18
12	Urban	30
TOTAL		210



### Method and Response

All questionnaires for the respondents in the schools, except those for field consultants, were mailed in January, 1971, with an accompanying explanatory letter for distribution and return (Appendix B), to all principals in 110 elementary schools throughout the school district. Central office and field consultant questionnaires were delivered personally.

Completed returns from the schools were received up to the end of March 1971. Table 7 presents an analysis of the responses from each respondent group.



Table 7

## Number of Questionnaires Distributed and Returned

Respondent	Questionnaires Distributed	Questionnaires Returned *	% Returned
Teachers	210	134	64
Coordinators	30 **	27	90
Field Consultants	9 **	9	100
Principals	110 **	95	86
Central Office Personnel	10	8	80
TOTALS	369	273	74

\* Does not include spoiled returned questionnaires which though not completely blank, contained information which was contradictory or significantly incomplete.

\*\* Includes all persons in that category of respondent in the urban elementary school system.



### Characteristics of Respondents

Table 8 provides a summary of data concerning the personal characteristics of respondents used in the study. The personal characteristics were used to determine the boundaries of the sub-groups. The comparison of these sub-groups' expectations are discussed in succeeding chapters.



Table 8  
Characteristics of All In-School Respondents

	Teachers	Coordinators	Field Consultants	Principals
	N=134	N=27	N=9	N=95
SIZE OF SCHOOL				
Under 10 teachers	16	4	3	30
11-15 teachers	36	9	4	29
16-20 teachers	41	6	2	18
Over 21 teachers	41	8		18
AGE				
20-25 years	50	2	-	-
26-30 years	29	10	3	2
31-40 years	17	5	2	21
41-50 years	13	4	2	26
Over 50 years	24	6	2	46
SEX				
Male	21	14	2	86
Female	112	13	7	9
MAIN TEACHING LEVEL				
Kindergarten	*		**	* **
Opportunity Room	3			
Grade 1	8			
Grade 2	21	4		
Grade 3	13	1		
Grade 4	21	4		
Grade 5	23	4		
Grade 6	23	3		
Grade 6	21	11		
NUMBER OF SUBJECTS TAUGHT				
One subject	*	*	**	*
Two subjects	7			17
Three subjects	4	3		16
Four subjects	10	8		11
Five subjects	16	6		8
Six subjects	31	9		6
Seven subjects	41			2
Eight subjects	5			2
Eight subjects	12			2
GENERALIST OR SPECIALIST				
Generalist	**		**	*
Generalist	118	27		38
Specialist	15	Nil		2
TEACHING EXPERIENCE				
Less 1 year	15	1		
1-2 years	30	1		
3-5 years	36	8	3	1
6-10 years	15	3		8
11-15 years	6	6	6	9
16-20 years	9	1		20
Over 20 years	23	7		57

\* Information on characteristics in some questionnaires was incomplete.

\*\* Information not requested of field consultants.

\*\*\* Information not requested of principals.



### TREATMENT OF DATA (Appendix D)

All raw data from six-point and other scales on all the "forced choice" questionnaires as well as the personal characteristics of respondents were processed through the use of IBM punch cards. A suitable computer program was selected to show mainly frequency distributions and percentages, as well as measures of association and tests of significance.

Subdivisions and subroutines were introduced into the programming as required to eliminate noncommittal responses from frequency distribution calculations, to collapse data, and to provide comparisons among the five main respondent groups, as well as among the various sub-groups.

### SUMMARY

The study obtained information from central office personnel as well as from 95 principals, 9 field consultants, 27 coordinators and 134 teachers in 110 elementary schools within a school district, mainly by the "forced choice" questionnaire technique. Computer analysis of data gave comparisons of perceptions on different aspects of the consultative function between groups and sub-groups of the respondents.



## Chapter 3

### A COMPARISON OF ROLE EXPECTATIONS HELD BY DIFFERENT RESPONDENT GROUPS

Central office personnel, principals, field consultants, coordinators and teachers were asked to give their opinions on 34 functions which elementary field consultants can perform. Comparisons were made among the opinions held by the five respondent groups on each of the functions.

#### INTER-GROUP CONSENSUS

The varying degrees of agreement-disagreement and noncommittal responses for the first 34 items on each questionnaire of the five respondent groups are compared in Table 30 (Appendix C). Noncommittal responses indicate the extent as well as the variation in experience or understanding of the new consultative role.

#### Noncommittal Respondents

The combined noncommittal responses are shown in Table 9, ranging from 3 to 22% for individual questions, with a mean of 10.8% for all personnel in schools. For every item, teachers make up no less than 70% of the combined noncommittal responses. Only one central office neutral response was recorded on sixteen of the thirty-four functions considered.



Table 9

Percentages of "No Opinion" and "Undecided" Responses Obtained from All Groups

No.	Function <sup>b</sup> (Abridged)	School Personnel				Total Central Office Personnel Noncommittal Responses <sup>a</sup> N=8	
		No Opinion		Undecided		Total Noncommittal Responses N=273	
		Teachers N=134	Others N=139	Teachers N=134	Others N=139		
1	In-service	1.9%	0.4%	2.3%	0.4%	5%	0%
2	Professional development	5.4	0.8	8.0	2.7	17	0
3	Concern about immediate needs of teachers	0.4	0.4	2.3	1.1	4	0
4	Involved in curriculum development	1.5	0.4	4.2	0.0	6	0
5	Involved in overall curriculum development	4.2	0.4	5.3	1.1	11	0
6	Prepare a "model learning" environment	2.3	0.8	2.7	1.5	8	12

<sup>a</sup> All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.<sup>b</sup> See Table 30 (Appendix C) for more detailed description of functions.



Table 9 (continued)

No.	Function <sup>b</sup> (Abridged)	School Personnel				Total Noncommittal Responses N=273	Total Central Office Personnel Noncommittal Responses <sup>a</sup> N=8
		No Opinion		Undecided			
		Teachers N=134	Others N=139	Teachers N=134	Others N=139		
7	Review educational and specialist subject literature	3.1%	0.8%	2.3%	1.1%	7%	12%
8	Prepare a newsletter	7.3	3.0	5.7	6.2	22	12
9	Inform teacher of consultative services	1.1	0.0	1.1	0.8	3	12
10	Advise central office of teacher needs	2.6	1.5	1.1	1.1	6	12
11	Liaise between different schools	7.6	3.0	3.0	2.3	16	12
12	Speak at staff meetings	2.3	1.2	5.0	1.5	4	12
13	Organize the work of coordinators	1.9	3.9	3.1	3.1	12	12
14	Demonstration lessons to individual teachers	2.7	0.0	1.9	0.4	5	12

<sup>a</sup> All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

<sup>b</sup> See Table 3 (Appendix C) for more detailed description of functions.



Table 9 (continued)

No.	Function <sup>b</sup> (Abridged)	School Personnel				Total Noncommittal Responses N=273	Total Central Office Personnel Noncommittal Responses <sup>a</sup> N=8
		No Opinion		Undecided			
		Teachers N=134	Others N=139	Teachers N=134	Others N=139		
15	Give demonstration lessons to groups of teachers	1.9%	1.5%	1.1%	1.2%	6%	0%
16	Advise teachers on classroom aids	1.1	1.1	0.4	0.4	3	0
17	Establish personal contacts with teachers	5.8	1.9	3.8	2.7	15	12
18	Spend some time teaching	4.6	2.3	4.6	3.1	15	12
19	Encourage teachers to experiment	1.9	0.0	0.8	0.8	3	0
20	60% of consultative time with individual teachers	4.6	0.4	5.7	1.9	13	12
21	60% of consultative time with small groups of teachers	5.0	1.5	5.0	2.3	14	12
22	Induct beginning teachers	4.2	0.4	5.7	2.3	14	12

<sup>a</sup> All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

<sup>b</sup> See Table 30 (Appendix C) for more detailed description of functions.



Table 9 (continued)

No.	Function <sup>b</sup> (Abridged)	School Personnel				Total Central Office Personnel Noncommittal Responses <sup>a</sup> N=8	
		No Opinion		Undecided			Total Noncommittal Responses N=273
		Teachers N=134	Others N=139	Teachers N=134	Others N=139		
23	Conduct pre-school teacher conferences	3.1%	1.5%	8.4%	4.2%	18%	12%
24	Give general assistance to teachers	4.2	0.0	5.8	2.3	12	0
25	Visit classroom at invitation of the teacher	1.9	0.0	4.2	1.1	8	0
26	Visit classrooms to assess program implementation	1.5	0.4	8.1	3.5	13	0
27	Visit classrooms to discuss teacher needs	4.2	0.0	1.9	1.5	8	0
28	Assist with disciplinary problems	1.9	0.4	3.4	0.4	6	0
29	Employ non-directive counselling	4.2	0.4	4.6	2.7	12	0

<sup>a</sup> All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

<sup>b</sup> See Table 30 (Appendix C) for more detailed description of functions.



Table 9 (continued)

No .	Function <sup>b</sup> (Abridged)	School Personnel				Total Central Office Personnel Noncommittal Responses <sup>a</sup> N=8	
		No Opinion		Undecided		Total Noncommittal Responses N=273	
		Teachers N=134	Others N=139	Teachers N=134	Others N=139		
30	Employ directive counselling	6.5%	1.2%	5.0%	3.5%	16%	12%
31	Give consideration to teachers' recommendations	2.3	0.0	1.9	1.5	6	0
MEANS		3.4	1.0	3.8	1.9	11	6

<sup>a</sup> All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

<sup>b</sup> See Table 30 (Appendix C) for more detailed description of functions.



A similar variation of response for both noncommittal categories are shown in Table 9 with means of less than 4% for teachers and less than 2% for all other respondents. Two main exceptions are Items 23 and 26 which show higher indecision on pre-school conferences and assessment of programs in the classroom.

The higher proportion of null responses from teachers, compared to central office and school administrators, is indicative of the more definite views held by the latter. Any hesitancy of opinion by teachers is more apparent over functions that may need further clarification in terms of classroom experience or need to be more universally implemented by the consultants. Professional development and preparing a newsletter are two such items.

#### Opinions of All Respondent Groups

As shown in Table 10, all four categories of in-school personnel attained a level of agreement greater than 65% on the first 25 of the 34 consultative functions. The only function on which there was the same level of disagreement refers to assistance with classroom disciplinary problems. Central office personnel responses showed a similar trend on the first 21 functions listed except for the function of field consultants speaking at school staff meetings, on which opinion was divided more evenly.



Table 10

Collapsed<sup>a</sup> Agreement Responses on the Functions of  
the Elementary Field Consultant Excluding Noncommittal Responses

Function No.	Function in descending order of overall agreement between all personnel in the schools (Abridged) <sup>b</sup>	Overall Opinion of All Personnel in the Schools N=265	Teacher Opinion N=134	Coordinator Opinion N=27	Field Consultant Opinion N=9	Principal Opinion N=95	Central Office Opinion N=8
31	Give consideration to teachers' recommendations	96%	93%	96%	100%	98%	100%
1	In-service work	95	93	100	100	94	100
19	Encourage teachers to experiment	94	94	89	100	96	100
16	Advise teachers on classroom aids	94	92	96	89	96	100
9	Inform teachers of consultative services	91	96	92	100	83	72
4	Involved in curriculum development with teachers	90	85	89	100	96	100
3	Concern about immediate needs of teachers	88	-	70	89	80	71
15	Give demonstration lessons to groups of teachers	86	83	96	89	87	100

<sup>a</sup> See Appendix D for specimen calculation of data.

<sup>b</sup> See Table 30 (Appendix C) for more detailed description of functions.



Table 10 (continued)

Function No.	Function in descending order of overall agreement between all personnel in the schools (Abridged) <sup>b</sup>	Overall Opinion of All Personnel in the Schools N=255	Teacher Opinion N=134	Coordinator Opinion N=27	Field Consultant Opinion N=9	Principal Opinion N=95	Central Office Opinion N=8
5	Involved in overall curriculum development	84%	80%	96%	100%	82%	86%
2	Professional development	82	79	82	89	85	100
10	Advise central office of teacher needs	80	86	85	78	71	100
27	Visit classrooms to discuss teacher needs	80	76	89	89	81	100
12	Speak at staff meetings	78	71	79	100	84	58*
11	Liaise between different schools	77	82	78	78	71	86
7	Review educational and specialist subject literature	75	-	85	78	69	100
17	Establish personal contacts with teachers	74	75	86	100	72	84
29	Employ non-directive counselling	73	66	79	100	76	84

<sup>b</sup> See Table 30 (Appendix C) for more detailed description of functions.

\* Denotes a difference of opinion to other respondent groups on the same function.



Table 10 (continued)

Function No.	Function in descending order of overall agreement between all personnel in the schools (Abridged) <sup>b</sup>	Overall Opinion of All Personnel in the Schools N=265	Teacher Opinion N=134	Coordinator Opinion N=27	Field Consultant Opinion N=9	Principal Opinion N=95	Central Office Opinion N=8
34	Explain central office policies	73%	77%	-	88%	73%	86%
14	Demonstration lessons to individual teachers	71	72	70	67	71	72
32	Lessen workload of central office	69	-	-	78	55	72
33	Liaise between central office and schools	69	82	-	100	61	75
18	Spend some time teaching	68	76	62	50	60	43*
30	Employ directive counselling	67	60	83	89	69	43*
20	60% of consultative time with individual teachers	67	-	44*	43*	78*	14*
6	Prepare a "model learning" environment	65	66	53	22*	70	43*
23	Conduct pre-school teacher conferences	63	60	54	89*	68	86*
21	60% of consultative time with small groups of teachers	60	-	73	88*	61	84*

<sup>b</sup> See Table 30 (Appendix C) for more detailed description of functions.

\* Denotes a difference of opinion to other respondent groups on the same function.



Table 10 (continued)

Function No.	Function in descending order of overall agreement between all personnel in the schools (Abridged) <sup>b</sup>	Overall Opinion of All Personnel in the Schools N= 265	Teacher Opinion N=134	Coordinator Opinion N=27	Field Consultant Opinion N=9	Principal Opinion N=95	Central Office Opinion N=8
25	Visit a classroom at invitation of the teacher	57%	57%	52%	56%	57%	38%*
8	Prepare a newsletter	50	48	63	50	49	43
24	Give general assistance to teachers	49	52	33*	33*	52	25*
22	Induct beginning teachers	49	67	33*	56	31*	29*
13	Organize the work of coordinators	47	-	62	57	55	14*
26	Visit classrooms to assess program implementation	40	30	45	78*	52	88*
28	Assist with disciplinary problems	35	33	37	56*	34	29

<sup>b</sup>

See Table 30 (Appendix C) for more detailed description of functions.

\* Denotes a difference of opinion to other respondent groups on the same function.



Some functions on which there was less consensus, especially with regard to central office opinion compared with other groups, tended to overlap with those of a consultative nature that may be carried out by principals and coordinators. Also, less affirmative opinions were given on functions that put the consultative services on a routine basis or tended to put an onus on any particular alter group. Some of the differences of opinion between different respondent groups in the schools are shown in Table 11.

Considerable variations of opinion were indicated on who should induct new teachers and also whether visitation of teachers at least twice a year was necessary.



Table 11

Differences of Opinion on the Consultative Functions  
between Respondent Groups

Question No. on the Teachers Questionnaire	Consultative Function (Abridged) <sup>a</sup>	Percentage Agreeing	
		Field Consultants	Teachers
6	Prepare "lighthouse" classrooms	22%	66%
24	General assistance to teachers	33	53
20	Visit teachers twice a year	43	63
18	Be practising teachers	50	70
26	Assess program implementation	78	26
		Field Consultants Coordinators	
22	Induct beginning teachers	55	33
26	Assess program implementation	78	46
		Field Consultants Principals	
6	Prepare "lighthouse" classroom	22	70
24	General assistance to teachers	33	51
20	Visit teachers twice a year	43	78
22	Induct beginning teachers	55	31
		Principals Teachers	
22	Induct beginning teachers	31	67

<sup>a</sup> See Table 30 (Appendix C) for more detailed description of functions.



Classroom Personnel Experiences and Understanding of the  
Consultative Services Provided

The estimated number of visitations of teachers by field consultants for the 1970-71 school year is shown in Table 12. Variations in the number of visitations by the nine consultants in five different subject areas can be attributed to the following three main factors.

1. The different kinds of teacher assistance given by consultants depends upon the subject area and grade level served.
2. The proportion of a consultant's consultative time taken up with committee work, editing a newsletter or other duties, varies with different subjects.
3. The assistance in consultative work is still carried out in the schools in some subject areas by central office personnel, (e.g. Art).



Table 12

Estimated<sup>a</sup> Number of Teachers and Schools Visited by the  
Nine Field Consultants during the School Year 1970-71

No. of Field Consultants per Subject	<u>Schools Visits</u>		Field Consultant's Subject Area	<u>Teacher Visitations</u>		Grade Levels Served
	Possible	Actual		Possible	Actual	
2	110	110	Language Arts	400	400	1-6
2	110	80	Early Childhood	150	120	1-3 and Kindergarten
2	44	44	Art	584	446	1-6 and Opportunity Room
1	110	40	Science	150	45	1-6 and Opportunity Room
1	110	50	Mathematics	200	120	1-6 and Opportunity Room
1	110	100	Social Studies	400	400	1-6 and Opportunity Room

<sup>a</sup> Computed on the basis of the number of visits completed by the end of 1970.



Assistance with classroom problems for elementary teachers had been obtained prior to 1970 from specialist central office personnel, specific subject coordinators working within a "cluster" of schools, and possibly to a lesser extent, depending upon school size, from the school principal. In order to find out how the field consultants supplemented the consultative services previously available, the questions, shown in Table 13, were asked of all teachers and coordinators.

In spite of Finlay's (1970:5) conceptions of the coordinator's role, and the ten-year period of their operation in the school system (Heron, 1969:51), only 62% of the teachers have sought directly the assistance of a coordinator. In contrast to direct coordinator and teacher contact, field consultants have given direct assistance to 28% of the same teacher sample during a period of six months.

Initial findings tend to suggest that field consultants with a four-fold increase in time for consultative work compared with coordinators, but at present only a third of their number, may fulfil the need for more readily available consultative teacher assistance.

The number of elementary teachers anticipating that they will not require any consultative assistance has hardly changed with the increased availability of consultative personnel, as 13% said they do not need the assistance from coordinators and 14% said they do not need assistance from field consultants. Similarly there is no change in the 4% of coordinators with a negative



attitude to working in co-operation with other consultative personnel.

A direct approach has been the primary means of contact with consultants by 79% of the coordinators and 28% of the teachers, as compared with 23% and 21% respectively through an administrator.

With teachers recording by far the highest number of noncommittal responses of any of the functions of the field consultant considered above, their awareness of the consultant's function was expected to be much lower than that of other respondent groups - the figure of 50% in Table 14 confirms this. In contrast, the considerable mistrust of consultants by teachers and their fears of evaluation, anticipated by some of the consultants themselves, was not borne out by other results in the table.



Table 13  
Classroom Personnel Experiences of the  
Consultative Services Provided

Experience of the Consultative Service <sup>a</sup>	Percentage of Classroom Personnel Experiencing this Service	
	<u>Teachers<sup>b</sup></u>	<u>Coordinators<sup>b</sup></u>
	N=134	N=27
Assistance from a coordinator by direct contact	62%	25%
Assistance from a coordinator through a principal	21	4
Assistance from a coordinator through a field consultant	2	8
Assistance from a field consultant by direct contact	28	79
Assistance from a field consultant through a principal	14	23
Assistance from a field consultant through a coordinator	5	4
Do not expect assistance from a coordinator	13	4
Do not expect assistance from a field consultant	14	4

<sup>a</sup> Related questions occur on page 3 of the Coordinators and Teachers opinion questionnaires (Appendix B).

<sup>b</sup> All percentages have been taken to the nearest whole number.



Table 14

Classroom Personnel Understanding of the  
Role of the Field Consultant

Understanding of the Consultative Service <sup>a</sup>	Percentage of Classroom Personnel Understanding this Service	
	<u>Teachers</u> <sup>b</sup>	<u>Coordinators</u> <sup>b</sup>
	N=134	N=27
Not aware of field consultant's function	50%	16%
Understand that field consultants evaluate teachers	13	4
Understand that field consultant evaluations are kept at central office	7	6

<sup>a</sup> Related questions occur on page 3 of the Coordinator and Teacher Opinion Questionnaires (Appendix B).

<sup>b</sup> All percentages have been taken to the nearest whole number.



### Career Prospects of a Consultative Position

All personnel in the schools were asked two questions concerning the career prospects of the consultative position (Appendix B).

First, if they felt the position of field consultant could constitute a life-time career for some accomplished teacher who wished to remain in close contact with teaching and students, rather than seek promotion by accepting administrative positions such as principal or in central office.

The answers to this question, shown in Table 15, indicated that the majority of all groups agreed that consultation could form a career position. Principals and teachers were the groups most strongly in favour.

The second question asked whether they would prefer to have the position of field consultant rather than that of principal, assuming they would receive the same salary for either position.

This question, possibly seldom raised, produced a high percentage of noncommittal responses as shown in Table 16. Of interest is the affirmative answers by 34% of principals, 52% of teachers, 54% of coordinators, but surprisingly only one consultant.



Table 15

Opinions of Personnel in Schools on  
Consultation as a Career Position

Respondent Group	N	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Possibly Yes	No	Noncommittal Responses
Principals	91	41%	33%	17%	9%	1%
Teachers	131	35	26	17	12	11
Coordinators	26	19	50	12	8	12
Field Consultants	9	22	22	33	22	0

Table 16

Preferences of Personnel in Schools for  
Field Consultant Position over Principalship

Respondent Group	N	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Possibly Yes	No	Noncommittal Responses
Principals	91	7%	6%	21%	52%	15%
Teachers	131	24	18	10	24	25
Coordinators	26	19	27	8	42	4
Field Consultants	9	0	0	11	78	11



## PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND CONSENSUS

To compare any trend of opinion with differences in age or experience, responses to the same items on each questionnaire of the four respondent groups in the schools were collapsed into five and six comparable categories respectively.

### Opinion in Relation to Age of Respondent

Differences of opinion between different age categories were found on only six of the thirty-four functions considered, as indicated in Table 17. Two of the six showed considerable differences of opinion among all respondent groups. They were concerned with "teacher visitation by field consultant twice a year" and "pre-school conferences."

Taking the functions in numerical order as shown in the table, any differences of opinions between age categories on the six functions can be summarized as follows:

1. Respondents over 50 years of age were more definite in their views that field consultants should be concerned with the immediate needs of teachers.
2. The over-40 respondent age group were divided in their opinions on consultants giving demonstration lessons to groups of teachers.
3. The youngest age group felt the most strongly that consultants should be practising teachers.



4. The over-30 age groups generally disagreed that consultants should encourage new ideas in the classroom.
5. Respondents in all the age categories, but especially the under-25 age group, tended to agree that consultants should not conduct pre-school conferences.
6. A minimum number of regular visitations of teachers by consultants was generally not supported by the under-50 age groups, and it was opposed by the under-30 age groups.



Table 17

Agreement Responses for Different Age Categories  
of All In-School Respondents

Function No.	20-25 years N=52	26-30 years N=44	31-40 years N=45	41-50 years N=47	Over 50 years N=78
1	83%	92%	95%	93%	91%
2	79	92	88	91	76
3	63	65	58	50	76*
4	80	75	82	64	73
5	52	48	56	43	45
6	88	98	87	91	85
7	90	84	74	68	80
8	88	83	74	69	74
9	63	75	74	85	85
10	38	36	41	49	64
11	63	70	72	78	70
12	90	91	83	71	90
13	90	88	91	100	97
14	86	76	71	75	72
15	74	73	73	49*	67
16	96	91	89	95	98
17	67	53	61	65	76
18	78*	47	72*	57	65
19	74	61	38*	40*	48*
20	68	67	68	53	68
21	35	50	37	55	62
22	48	62	60	62	55
23	26*	43	40	51	45
24	89	78	87	74	80
25	29	44	26	36	38
26	65	71	74	68	80
27	60	55	68	67	74
28	91	95	93	100	97
29	89	71	58	57	65
30	85	78	58	72	62
31	72	68	73	73	79
32	12*	19*	43	54	71
33	50	58	77	80	85
34	79	78	92	95	94

\* Indicated a markedly different opinion for a sub-group(s)  
compared with other sub-groups.



### Opinion in Relation to Length of Teaching Experience

Because the length of teaching experience is generally closely associated with age, the same lack of disparity found between responses from different age categories was expected from different experience categories. To show the similarity of responses with changes of experience, the first 21 items on the questionnaires of each of the four respondent groups are compared in Table 18. No outstanding differences of opinion can be attributed to any experience category of respondent and a similar trend of agreement-disagreement was found between the six categories selected.



Table 18

Agreement Responses for Different Experience  
Categories for All In-School Respondents

Function No.	1-2 years N=42	3-5 years N=47	6-10 years N=24	11-15 years N=26	16-20 years N=28	Over 20 years N=81
1	95%	98%	92%	96%	93%	93%
2	77	83	96	75	77	86
3	93	90	92	73	71	92
4	79	96	91	96	89	93
5	82	88	91	91	72	82
6	53	67	90	33*	58	75
7	75	78	83	82	70	70
8	41*	60	71	51	48	44*
9	100	99	98	97	77	87
10	91	70	89	85	63	76
11	83	80	76	72	86	73
12	68	70	78	77	78	86
13	34*	41*	27*	58	52	64
14	66	73	76	73	63	74
15	90	93	81	92	71	86
16	89	89	98	96	97	99
17	80	72	83	75	61	74
18	70	77	80	63	59	66
19	89	96	100	89	90	100
20	64	52	61	36*	68	83
21	73	44*	73	73	74	52

\* Indicates a markedly different opinion for a sub-group(s) compared with other sub-groups.



## SUMMARY

Inter-group consensus between the five respondent groups was indicated on at least 21 of 34 functions, with an overall agreement of greater than 70% on each function, for all respondent groups.

Total noncommittal responses from all groups showed a mean of less than 11%, with teachers providing a high proportion of the null response category.

With the introduction of field consultants into the elementary school system, initial findings on their role tended to indicate an increase in understanding and contact between teachers and all personnel in the schools involved to any degree in a consultative capacity.

The majority of all groups agreed that the consultant position could provide an alternative to administration as a career position, but the minority of personnel in the schools, including only one field consultant, expressed a preference for the consultative position over a principalship.

No apparent differences or trends of opinion can be attributed to any differences in age or experience, when considering all respondent groups.



## Chapter 4

### TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS OF ROLE

Comparisons were made between (1) the kind of consultative services envisaged by field consultants, coordinators and principals, and the kind most desired by teachers, and (2) the expectations of teachers with regard to consultative services in the classroom, on the basis of teaching level, teaching experience, years of training, number of subjects taught and self-categorisation.

### INTRA-GROUP CONSENSUS

Variations in agreement and noncommittal responses within the teacher group on the suggested functions of the field consultant were compared with the overall variations of opinion between all personnel in the schools on the same functions.

#### Noncommittal Respondents

As shown in Table 9, Chapter 3, over three times the percentage of teachers had recorded neutral responses on nearly all the 31 consultative functions considered, compared to the percentage of combined similar responses by principals, field consultants and coordinators. The high proportion of noncommittal responses reflected the lack of understanding teachers have of the



consultative function compared with other respondents in the schools.

Although comparatively high to all other groups combined, responses from teachers in each noncommittal category showed a similar variation with each function, except on functions 23 and 26 in which there were relatively higher "undecided" responses, referring to pre-school conferences and assessment of programs in the classroom.

#### Opinions in Relation to Consensus between All Groups

Responses for all personnel in the schools and teachers found in Table 10, Chapter 3, are listed in descending order of agreement, illustrating inter-group and intra-group consensus on the same 25 consultative functions.

#### PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND CONSENSUS

Opinions by various categories of teachers on the anticipated functions of field consultants were examined, and the opinion of each category or sub-group compared to overall teacher opinion on the same functions, especially the first 21 listed on which there was 70% consensus between teachers and other respondent groups. Teachers were categorised on the basis of (1) years of training, (2) teaching level, (3) number of subjects taught, (4) sex of teacher, and (5) self classification as a "generalist" or "specialist." Neutral and positive responses for each category or sub-group are listed in Tables 19-23.



Table 19

## Comparison of Teacher Responses for Different Numbers of Years of Training

Function No.	Function a (Abridged)	Descending Order of Overall Agreement between Teachers  N=133	Agreement Responses with differences in the Years of Training					Noncommittal Responses with differences in the Years of Training				
			2 yrs	3 yrs	4 yrs	5 yrs		2 yrs	3 yrs	4 yrs	5 yrs	
			N=31	N=19	N=67	N=16		N=31	N=19	N=67	N=16	
3	Teacher needs	97%	96%	100%	95%	100%		10%	5%	5%	0%	
9	Consultation information	96	93	100	97	100		7	6	3	7	
19	Teacher experimentation	94	90	94	97	93		3	11	6	0	
31	Teacher recommendation	93	93	100	91	93		7	11	11	0	
1	In-service	93	88	100	95	86		17	17	3	7	
16	Classroom aids	92	96	95	89	93		7	0	2	7	
10	Advise central office	86	89	100	81	86		10	10	6	7	
4	Curriculum (teachers)	85	87	83	90	72		21	5	11	7	
15	Demonstrations (groups)	83	90	83	81	86		3	11	6	7	
11	Liaison (schools)	82	87	80	80	78		26	20	15	40*	
5	Curriculum (overall)	80	64*	86	85	83		17	26	19	20	
2	Professional Development	79	82	67	82	83		41*	21	24	20	
7	Review literature	77	79	89	76	62*		14	5	11	13	
27	Visit classroom	76	77	93	72	75		7	22	11	20	
17	Personal contact	75	74	85	74	67		18	32	18	20	
14	Demonstrations (individuals)	72	82	63	66	92		3	16	8	20	
12	Staff meetings	71	77	58*	69	71		13	37*	11	7	

<sup>a</sup> See Table 30 (Appendix C) for more detailed description of functions.

\* Denotes a different response to other sub-groups.



Table 19 (continued)

Function No	Function <sup>a</sup> (Abridged)	Descending Order of Overall Agreement between Teachers  N=133	Agreement Responses with differences in the Years of Training					Noncommittal Responses with differences in the Years of Training				
			2 yrs	3 yrs	4 yrs	5 yrs		2 yrs	3 yrs	4 yrs	5 yrs	
			N=31	N=19	N=67	N=16		N=31	N=19	N=67	N=16	
18	Teaching duties	68%	83%	87%	70%	78%		21%	16%	14%	40%	
22	Induction	67	77	75	60	70		13	13	15	33	
21	Consultation groups	67	73*	53	49	50		24	21	19	20	
29	Non-direct counselling	66	70	54*	70	65		18	32	12	27	
6	"Model learning" environment	66	78	56	63	64		7	5	14	7	
20	Consultation individuals	63	65	62	63	64		21	32	19	27	
30	Directive counselling	60	71	80*	51	64		20	44*	19	27	
23	Pre-school conferences	60	52	75*	59	67		14	37*	25	20	
25	Teacher invitations	57	52	71*	52	69		14	11	12	14	
24	General assistance	52	55	69*	49	46		21	31	15	27	
8	Newsletter	48	44	69*	44	50		14	16	30	47	
13	Organize coordinators	38	44	50	32	36		11	16	5	27	
28	Discipline	33	33	23	36	31		7	32*	6	13	
26	Program implementation	30	30	37	26	0		20	32*	11	47*	
			MEAN					14	29	13	19	

<sup>a</sup> See Table 30 (Appendix C) for more detailed description of functions.

\* Denotes a different response to other sub-groups.



Table 20

## A Comparison in Teacher Responses for Different Grade Levels Taught

Function No	Function <sup>a</sup> (Abridged)	Descending Order of Overall Agreement between Teachers N=133	Agreement Responses with differences in the Grade Levels taught				Noncommittal Responses with differences in the Grade Levels taught			
			Op.Rm.	Gr.1&2	Gr.3&4	Gr.5&6	Op.Rm.	Gr.1&2	Gr.3&4	Gr.5&6
			N=8	N=34	N=44	N=44	N=8	N=34	N=44	N=44
3	Teacher needs	97%	100%	97%	93%	100%	0%	7%	7%	2%
9	Consultation information	96	88	96	98	98	0	2	9	2
19	Teacher experimentation	94	100	95	92	98	12	2	2	9
1	In-service	93	100	92	98	93	13	5	12	7
16	Classroom aids	82	100	94	88	98	0	0	7	2
10	Advise central office	86	87	79	91	84	0	5	7	11
4	Curriculum (teachers)	85	100	83	93	93	38*	4	14	12
15	Demonstrations (groups)	83	100	78	90	85	0	0	7	11
11	Liaison (schools)	82	67	89	85	79	25	13	27	22
5	Curriculum (overall)	80	50*	66	67	88	50*	19	18	18
2	Professional development	79	83	79	72	89	25	16	30	33
7	Review literature	77	83	89	73	72	25*	5	9	14
27	Visit classrooms	76	100	77	78	64	13	11	9	15
17	Personal contact	75	33	79	71	79	25	16	20	22
14	Demonstrations (individuals)	72	100	56*	83	72	12	0	11	14
12	Staff meetings	71	88	67	66	77	0	4	25	16

<sup>a</sup> See Table 30 (Appendix C) for more detailed description of functions.

\* Denotes a different response to other sub-groups.



Table 20 (continued)

Function No.	Function <sup>a</sup> (Abridged)	Descending Order of Overall Agreement between Teachers N=133	Agreement Responses with differences in the Grade Levels taught				Noncommittal Responses with differences in the Grade Levels taught			
			Op.Rm.	Gr.1&2	Gr.3&4	Gr.5&6	Op.Rm.	Gr.1&2	Gr.3&4	Gr.5&6
			N=8	N=34	N=44	N=44	N=8	N=34	N=44	N=44
18	Teaching duties	68%	67%	74%	77%	84%	25%	14%	11%	28%
22	Induction	67	50*	70	69	65	50*	16	23	16
21	Consultation groups	67	60	51*	63	46*	37	16	20	17
29	Non-directive counselling	66	85	63	71	58	12	22	21	15
6	"Model learning" environment	66	72	67	67	60	12	18	9	12
20	Consultation individuals	63	100	66	58	61	12	21	20	19
23	Pre-school conferences	60	50*	47*	59	74	0	18	20	30*
25	Teacher invitations	57	29*	59	46	69	12	5	14	14
24	General assistance	52	86*	48	47	56	12	11	22	27
8	Newsletter	48	38	55	43	51	0	9	41*	31*
13	Organize coordinators	38	38	35	47	39	0	5	13	22
28	Discipline	33	54	43	70*	40	12	5	16	10
26	Program implementation	30	38	29	23	25	0	22	22	19
			MEAN				15	10	17	16

<sup>a</sup> See Table 30 (Appendix C) for more detailed description of functions.

\* Denotes a different response to other sub-groups.



Table 21

A Comparison in Teacher Responses for Different Numbers of Subjects Taught

Function No.	Function <sup>a</sup> (Abridged)	Descending Order of Overall Agreement between Teachers N=133	Agreement Responses with differences in the Number of Subjects taught						Noncommittal Responses with differences in the Number of Subjects taught					
			1-2	3	4	5	6	7-8	1-2	3	4	5	6	7-8
			N=11	N=10	N=16	N=31	N=41	N=17	N=11	N=10	N=16	N=31	N=41	N=17
3	Teacher needs	97%	100%	100%	100%	93%	95%	100%	0%	10%	6%	6%	5%	10%
9	Consultation information	96	84	100	94	100	97	95	13	10	0	3	3	4
19	Teacher experimentation	94	88	100	93	97	94	86	0	0	12	3	10	0
1	In-service	93	79	90	93	100	92	96	0	0	0	6	13	8
16	Classroom aids	92	88	100	100	96	85	88	0	0	0	7	3	4
10	Advise central office	86	84	78	81	89	87	75	13	10	0	10	7	8
4	Curriculum (teachers)	85	66	100	93	93	85	64*	0	10	13	10	15	19
15	Demonstrations (groups)	83	75	60*	100	90	89	62*	13	0	6	6	10	0
11	Liaison (schools)	82	69	100	79	86	86	55*	13	20	12	13	30	34
5	Curriculum (overall)	80	80	89	93	87	83	50*	0	10	13	26	27	15
2	Professional development	79	75	80	100	88	76	85	17	50*	19	40*	13	29
7	Review literature	77	63	56*	71	73	82	90	16	10	12	10	3	17
27	Visit classrooms	76	40	77	66	77	78	81	23	10	6	17	15	0
17	Personal contact	75	75	100	39*	82	67	87	13	0*	19	24	23	13
14	Demonstrations (individuals)	72	75	55*	91	68	78	78	16	0*	19	7	10	0
12	Staff meetings	71	92	60	79	75	66	40*	13	0*	13	22	20	10
18	Teaching duties	68	63	78	75	79	79	75	16	10	25	20	17	5

<sup>a</sup> See Table 30 (Appendix C) for more detailed description of functions.

\* Denotes a different response to other sub-groups.



Table 21 (continued)

Function No.	Function <sup>a</sup> (Abridged)	Descending Order of Overall Agreement between Teachers  N=133	Agreement Responses with differences in the Number of Subjects taught						Noncommittal Responses with differences in the Number of Subjects taught					
			1-2		3		4		5		6		7-8	
			N=11		N=10		N=16		N=31		N=41		N=17	
			N=11		N=10		N=16		N=31		N=41		N=17	
22	Induction	67%	56%	67%	50%*	77%	64%	71%	14%	10%	12%	27%	22%	13%
21	Consultation groups	67	66	70	40*	71	51	27*	33	30	6	20	13	28
29	Non-directive counselling	66	40*	60	65	65	67	80*	20	0	6	24	25	5
6	"Model learning" environment	66	70	56	84	68	56	57	16	10	0	7	15	4
20	Consultation individuals	63	59	85	50	64	61	50	50*	30	0	17	15	33
23	Pre-school conferences	60	30	43	66	63	59	47	20	30	6	37	20	28
25	Teacher invitations	57	71	56	57	55	54	79	24	10	12	3	15	13
24	General assistance	52	65	30*	46	31*	61	61	16	0	19	34*	15	14
8	Newsletter	48	13	40	67	46	43	58	29	50*	19	20	30	28
13	Organize coordinators	38	29	0*	31	40	58*	40	27	10	0	7	8	15
28	Discipline	33	23	39	21	24	46*	19	0	20	12	6	13	0
26	Program implementation	30	13	22	15	30	30	22	29	10	19	27	15	14
			MEAN											
			15	11	10	15	15	11						

<sup>a</sup> See Table 30 (Appendix C) for more detailed description of functions.

\* Denotes a different response to other sub-groups.



Table 22

Male and Female Teacher Responses on  
the Functions of the Elementary Field Consultant

Function No.	Male N=21		Female N = 108	
	Agreement	Noncommittal Responses	Agreement	Noncommittal Responses
1	75%	15%	88%	8%
2	85*	5	54*	32
3	62	5	50	5
4	71	15	77	11
5	71	24	64	18
6	71	15	60	9
7	62	14	70	10
8	34	28	37	25
9	95	0	92	5
10	71	5	80	8
11	57	24	65	21
12	66	24	59	13
13	47	10	31	10
14	70	15	66	7
15	85	10	76	6
16	81	5	91	3
17	62	19	62	19
18	61	34*	62	16*
19	85	10	90	5
20	53	14	50	22
21	38	24	45	19
22	58	14	51	22
23	62	19	43	24
24	35	42*	43	16*
25	57	10	49	13
26	23	29	20	18
27	61	10	67	13
28	19	19	32	9
29	44	28	56	16
30	38	29	37	32
31	85	5	85	9
MEAN	62	17	60	15

\* Denotes a difference in response between the two sub-groups.



Table 23

Comparison of Agreement Responses by  
"Generalist" and "Specialist" Teachers<sup>a</sup>

No.	Function (Abridged) <sup>b</sup>	Generalist Teachers	Specialist Teachers
		N=99	N=12
1	In-service	74%	92%
2	Professional development	79	87
3	Concern about immediate needs of teachers	96	100
4	Involved in curriculum development with teachers	75	75
5	Involved in overall curriculum development	79	83
6	Prepare a "model learning" environment	67	58
7	Review educational and specialist subject literature	76	80
8	Prepare a newsletter	48	45
9	Inform teacher of consultative services	96	100
10	Advise central office of teacher needs	84	100
11	Liaise between different schools	83	75
12	Speak at staff meetings	69	83
13	Organize the work of coordinators	39	18
14	Demonstration lessons to individual teachers	72	67
15	Give demonstration lessons to groups of teachers	83	74
16	Advise teachers on classroom aids	92	93

<sup>a</sup> See "self-categorisation" item in Part I of Teacher Opinion Questionnaire (Appendix C).

<sup>b</sup> See Table 30 (Appendix C) for more detailed description of functions.



Table 23 (continued)

No.	Function (Abridged) <sup>b</sup>	Generalist Teachers	Specialist Teachers
		N=99	N=12
17	Establish personal contacts with teachers	73%	91%
18	Spend some time teaching	76	80
19	Encourage teachers to experiment	94	100
20	60% of consultative time with individual teachers	61*	90
21	60% of consultative time with small groups of teachers	52*	80
22	Induct beginning teachers	65	82
23	Conduct pre-school teacher conferences	58	73
24	Give general assistance to teachers	50*	78
25	Visit classroom at invitation of the teacher	55	75
26	Visit classroom to assess program implementation	25	40
27	Visit classroom to discuss teacher needs	74	90
28	Assist with disciplinary problems	33	33
29	Employ non-directive counselling	65	70
30	Employ directive counselling	59	70
31	Give consideration to teachers' recommendations	93	92
32	Lessen workload of central office	83	91
33	Liaise between central office and schools	82	83
34	Explain central office policies	82*	50*

<sup>b</sup> See Table 30 (Appendix C) for more detailed description of functions.

\* Denotes a marked difference in response between two sub-groups.



### Opinions in Relation to Training of Teacher

In Table 19 noncommittal responses are generally high with percentages ranging to over 40 for all four training categories. Only three exceptionally high neutral responses in three separate sub-groups refer to a consultative function on which there was general overall teacher consensus. Similarly only four agreement responses in separate sub-groups show a difference to those of the other three sub-groups on the same function.

The three-year trained teachers show the highest apparent difference in neutral and positive responses compared to other sub-groups.

### Opinions in Relation to Grade Level Taught

Table 20 shows little difference of opinion between any of the sub-groups and overall teacher consensus. Four differences in agreement responses to overall consensus were found in the opportunity room and Grades 1-2 categories. Only one of the first 21 functions showed differences with more than one grade-level sub-group. Four comparatively high noncommittal responses were recorded in the opportunity room category on functions showing general consensus.

### Opinions in Relation to the Number of Subjects Taught

Table 21 showed only one difference of opinion between overall teacher consensus and the sub-group of teachers teaching



the least number of subjects, but seven differences of opinion with the sub-group teaching the highest number of subjects. Low levels of agreement by teachers with the highest number of subjects to teach were on field consultant involvement in curriculum development, at staff meetings, with groups of teachers, and liaison between schools. Higher agreement was shown by this sub-group to overall teacher consensus on the function of non-direct counselling by the consultant.

Categories of teachers teaching 3 and 4 subjects contained three differences of opinion to consensus, but the remaining two had none. Only one consultative function on which there was overall teacher consensus showed a difference with more than one of the sub-groups. Noncommittal responses with a few outstanding exceptions were no higher than the neutral responses of the entire teacher group.

#### Opinions in Relation to Sex of Teacher

With similar "means" obtained for both categories of responses listed in Table 22, the 31 consultative functions revealed little difference of opinion between male and female respondents. The only exceptions showed that female teachers felt less inclined to seek help from field consultants in professional development, and male neutral responses were much higher on two functions.



### Opinions in Relation to "Self-Categorisation"

Only 12 teachers regarded themselves as "specialists." Table 23 shows they generally had similar expectations of field consultants to the majority of their colleagues.

### SUMMARY

Expectations of field consultants showed little significant variation between any of the teacher sub-groups. Three consultative functions on which there was some difference of opinion, or high null response, were overall curriculum development, consultative time spent with groups of teachers, and induction of new teachers.



## Chapter 5

### IN-SCHOOL AND CENTRAL OFFICE CONSULTATIVE PERSONNEL EXPECTATIONS OF THE ROLE

Prior to 1970 and the introduction of field consultants, consultative services to elementary teachers in the school district investigated were provided by coordinators, principals and central office personnel. Consideration was given to (1) the complementary and supplementary effects of the field consultant's role on any established classroom consultative services, (2) the co-operation between the field consultant and two in-school groups, (3) the overlap of function between the field consultant and other consultative personnel, (4) the differences in opinions of coordinators, principals and central office staff with the overall consensus of personnel in the schools on the functions of the field consultant, and (5) the central office overview of the field consultant's function in the elementary school system.

#### OPINIONS OF COORDINATORS ON THE FIELD CONSULTANT'S FUNCTION AND ROLE RELATIONSHIPS

Opinions of coordinators are compared in Table 10, Chapter 3, with the overall responses of all personnel in the schools.

With a similar or higher level of consensus for coordinators than for all personnel in the schools on most functions, agreement between coordinators was indicated at the 65% level or above for the first twenty-four of the consultative functions listed.



On pages 6-7 of the Coordinator Opinion Questionnaire (Appendix C) are twelve questions that refer to the role of the field consultant and the coordinator. The number of agreement responses from coordinators to each question are given in Table 24.

The distribution of responses suggests that the majority of coordinators viewed the consultant's role in relation to their own as basically one of liaison between in-school or central office personnel providing consultative assistance to teachers. Even 75% of their number supported the idea of consultants directing coordinators. Any significant variation of opinion referred either to the routine nature of the field consultant's role or the differentiation of it from the coordinator's role in the classroom.



Table 24

Responses of Coordinators on the Functions of the Field Consultant  
with a Direct Relationship to Their Role

Question No. on the Coordinators Questionnaire	Function of the Field Consultant	Number of Agreement Responses (N=27)	Number of Noncommittal Responses
41	Liaise between coordinators	25	1
42	Liaise between coordinators and central office	24	2
40	Available to all teachers and coordinators for advice	24	1
37	Supplement the work of coordinators	24	0
38	Direct the activities of coordinators	17	1
34 and 36	Assist teachers in any class	12	2
43	Liaise between coordinators and principals	11	0
32	Visit a teacher at least twice a year	10	2
33	Visit a teacher at regular intervals	8	1
39	More a generalist than a coordinator	7	1
35	Assist teachers in all subject areas	7	0



OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS ON THE FIELD CONSULTANT'S  
FUNCTION AND AN OVERVIEW OF ROLE RELATIONSHIPS  
IN THE SCHOOLS

The first nineteen agreement responses from principals on the functions of field consultants, listed in Table 10, Chapter 3, indicated an intra-group consensus over the 70% level. The remaining opinions of principals on the consultative functions listed in Table 10 showed very little difference to overall in-school personnel opinions, except for functions that suggest some interjection by field consultants between principals and their staffs, e.g. the induction of beginning teachers by field consultants.

The responses shown in Table 25 to the questions in Part III of the Principal Opinion Questionnaire (Appendix C) suggest the following:

1. The consultative services provided by both field consultants and coordinators were quite satisfactory.
2. Supplementation and overlap of function occurred between field consultants and coordinators.
3. Field consultants were generally sought by teachers directly.
4. Very few conflicts existed between field consultants and administrators.
5. Some evidence existed of field consultants directing coordinators and liaising between them and principals.

The responses in Part IV of the Principal Opinion Questionnaire shown in Table 26 illustrate the generally clear understanding by principals of the field consultant's role, with no threat to their formal authority recorded.



Table 25

## Experiences of the Principals of the Consultative Services Provided

Question No. on the Principal Questionnaire	Experiences of the Consultative Service	Responses by Principals N=95				
		Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
38	Field consultants respond to a teacher request	30%	49%	18%	3%	0%
44	Satisfaction on service from coordinators	11	63	21	4	1
39	Field consultants sought by teachers	11	36	36	16	1
42	Overlap of function between the coordinator and the field consultant	8	35	39	14	3
45	Field consultants supplementing the work of coordinators	3	29	45	19	3
47	Field consultants directing coordinators	0	17	33	34	17
41	Field consultants by-passing formal communication channels	0	10	31	47	12
46	Liaison between coordinators and principals by field consultants	0	7	31	40	21
40	Field consultants sought without a teacher's knowledge	1	3	26	29	41
43	Conflicts between principals and field consultants	0	0	8	40	52



Table 26

The Principals' Understanding of the  
Field Consultant's Role

Question No. on the Principal Questionnaire	Understanding of the Consultative Services	<u>Responses by Principals</u> N=95	
		Yes	No
48	Satisfaction with the service provided by field consultants	83%	17%
50	Familiarity with services provided by field consultants	78	22
49	Threat to formal authority by field consultants	0	100



OPINIONS OF CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF ON THE  
FIELD CONSULTANT'S FUNCTION AND AN OVERVIEW  
OF CONSULTATIVE SERVICES PROVIDED

The central office staff having a direct working relationship with field consultants recorded their opinions through (1) questionnaire responses on the 34 suggested functions of field consultants, (2) interview responses on the needs of the elementary school district that prompted the introduction of the field consultant, the changes occurring as a result of their introduction and suggestions for improvements in their role.

Opinions of Central Office on the Field Consultant's Function

Eighteen of the first nineteen central office agreement responses on the functions of field consultants - Part I Central Office Opinion Questionnaire (Appendix C), listed in Table 10, Chapter 3 - indicated agreement above the 70% level within the group.

Central office opinions on field consultant functions that tend to overlap the principal's role, interject between central office staff and principals, or put the duties of the consultant on a routine or stereotyped base, contrasted sharply with the consensus found between all the personnel in the schools.

Opinions of Central Office Relating to Suggested Improvements  
on the Field Consultant's Function

A summary of interview responses to questions from Part II of the Central Office Questionnaire (Appendix C), on suggested improvements to the field consultant's function, are shown in



Table 27. With few exceptions consensus was indicated within the central office group on the improvements achieved in the consultative service to teachers by the introduction of field consultants, and on the improvements necessary to further improve their function. Most of the views expressed coincided with those of the four in-school groups, and included an immediate concern for the problems raised by the field consultants themselves.



Table 27

Summary of Interview Responses by  
Central Office Personnel on Specific Items<sup>a</sup>

Item	Responses
	N=8
1. <u>Suggestions:</u>	
a. Direct attention of central office staff to the need for consideration of placement of consultants.	<p data-bbox="693 762 1488 839">All respondents stressed the necessity for improved placement procedures.</p> <p data-bbox="693 886 1572 963">One suggestion was that consultants should be based in central office.</p> <p data-bbox="693 1009 1470 1136">The dangers of "empire building" with more centralisation or "zoning" of consultants were pointed out.</p>
b. Make school administrators better informed about the consultative function.	Overall agreement that central office staff need to clarify the role of the consultant and then better inform the school administrators.
c. Make teachers aware consultants are not evaluators.	<p data-bbox="693 1396 1517 1679">With one exception the perceptions by teachers of consultants as evaluators were not regarded as a serious problem, but all suggested there was room for improvement - perhaps by discussion on the various aspects of the consultative role in staff meetings.</p> <p data-bbox="693 1723 1572 1803">One view expressed regarded "evaluation" as co-operation at the consultative level.</p>
d. Provide opportunities for teachers to develop specialist subject interests.	<p data-bbox="693 1849 1579 1975">Overall opinions suggested that elementary teachers are "generalists" rather than "specialists."</p> <p data-bbox="693 2019 1539 2305">The need for specialisation was found to exist and some felt encouragement should be given to teachers, especially at the upper elementary level and in those subjects (e.g. Art, Drama, Literature, Music and Physical Education) requiring specific skills or creative expression.</p>

<sup>a</sup> See Part II Central Office Opinion Questionnaire in Appendix C.



Table 27 (continued)

Item	Responses
	N=8
	Some concern was expressed for the "dangers" of departmentalising the elementary level.
e. Provide opportunities for field consultants to meet together.	The necessity and the regularity of meetings were questioned by some, but the professional development of the field consultant group, dependent upon opportunities to meet together was also stressed.
f. Provide more time for consultative work.	The majority of respondents agreed that more teacher-consultants needed to be appointed or demands on existing appointees necessitated a full-time consultative role.
	One dissenting opinion stressed the desirability of the existing teacher/consultation role to maintain the consultant's effectiveness in the classroom.
	A further alternative opinion suggested an annual rotation of personnel between the full-time teaching and the full-time consultation roles.
g. Incorporate flexible timetabling for elementary field consultants.	The need for more flexible timetabling was stressed by all.
	Administrative difficulties were referred to as well as a few solutions to the present problems - like providing a competent teacher substitute service or freeing consultants of teaching responsibilities.
h. Provide specific time allotments per subject for coordinators	Opinion was divided on restricting the present flexibility of the coordinator's consultative time, but reference was made to the "neglect" by them in their least specialized subject area.



Table 27 (continued)

Item	Responses
	N=8
i. Provide opportunities to build "lighthouse" classrooms.	<p>No evidence of any directives given to consultants to provide such a facility in their classrooms, and the difficulties they would encounter if attempting to do so were emphasized by all.</p> <p>It was suggested that consultants could encourage such an "idea" in selective classroom situations.</p>
j. Provide opportunities for more involvement by field consultants in central office decision-making.	<p>The majority agreed that the extent to which a consultant's subject expertise can have an influence on central office decision-making will depend upon the overall effectiveness of the "school system."</p> <p>Involvement in central office decision-making was not regarded as a major function of the consultant.</p>
2. <u>Improvements</u> achieved in the efficiency of the total school organization.	<p>With only one general dissenting opinion a considerable number of improvements were listed by six of the other respondents and included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The absolute indispensibility of the field consultant's counsel in developing educational policy and practice at the elementary level.</li> <li>2. The improvements in the quality of programs.</li> <li>3. The communication to teachers from various sources, especially from central office.</li> <li>4. Better use of resource materials by teachers.</li> <li>5. Purpose and direction in in-service work.</li> </ol>



Table 27 (continued)

Item	Responses
	N=8
	6. Enthusiasm shown by teachers.
	7. Better classroom facilities.
3. <u>Suggestions for further improvements in the field consultant's role.</u>	<p>Excluding one noncommittal response the various aspects of immediate concern by central office included all the problems raised by the consultants themselves (Appendix B, p.7. of the field consultant's questionnaire).</p> <p>Specific suggestions by central office personnel included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increasing the part-time consultant to teacher ratio to one consultant for every 100 teachers.</li> <li>2. Eliminating the classroom teaching duties of the consultants.</li> <li>3. Coordinating some workload areas, e.g. social studies with language arts, and science with mathematics.</li> </ol>
4. <u>Specialized courses for coordinators or field consultants.</u>	<p>The necessity for professional competence and self development by incumbents of the role was realized by most respondents.</p> <p>Seven central office personnel referred to the necessity for courses of a "practical" nature including such subjects as curricula, supervision, planning, administration and "sensitivity training."</p>
5. <u>The needs that prompted the introduction of the position of field consultant.</u>	<p>Overall opinions suggested a desire to reduce the roster at central office, but at the same time provide a viable alternative for teacher assistance <u>in the field.</u></p>



Table 27 (continued)

Item	Responses
	N=8
	A categorisation of reasons given:
	1. Decentralisation of central office consultative services.
	2. To fulfill a "felt-need" by elementary administrators that the teacher to supervisory ratios were not on a par with other levels in the school system.
	3. The need for curriculum expertise at the elementary level both in the schools and in close liaison with central office.
	4. To supplement the classroom organization deficiencies inherent in the present university teacher-training programs.



## SUMMARY

Intra-group consensus of central office staff, principals and coordinators, at the 70% level, was indicated on the same 21 of the suggested consultative functions. Differences in consensus indicated that coordinators viewed field consultants in a liaison type of role between all coordinators, and school or central office administrators were a little wary of any consultative duties that interjected between their established role relationships or tended to "stereotype" the consultant's role.

Both principals and central office staff expressed general overall satisfaction with services provided by the field consultants, and neither mentioned any conflict between them and administrators.

The overall needs that prompted the introduction of the field consultant were generally agreed upon by the central office respondents. With an awareness of the problems facing the incumbents of the newly created position, a variety of alternative solutions to the problems and improvements to the role were suggested.



## Chapter 6

### THE FIELD CONSULTANTS' EXPERIENCES IN THE ROLE

As described in Chapter 2 the experiences of each field consultant in his/her recently appointed role were recorded in a structured interview, and the categorised responses of all consultants formed a basis for the design of all the research instruments used in the study. This chapter considers the opinions of the consultants on items raised by themselves with those of others in their own group, and with other respondent groups.

#### INTRA-GROUP CONSENSUS

##### Consensus on Function

The level of agreement between the responses of field consultants as shown in Table 10, Chapter 3, was generally higher than those of all other respondent groups for the first 21 functions listed. Agreement on these functions included 18 with an over 80% consensus and only 26 dissenting consultant opinions out of a total of 162 recorded.

Sharp disagreement existed within the consultant group and between consultants and overall schools' personnel opinion on the question whether consultants should teach regularly in the classroom. Further, only three consultants agreed that most of their consultative duty time should be spent with individual teachers.



### Consensus on Problems Encountered

To obtain a more accurate assessment of each problem raised in structured interviews with all nine consultants, the whole group was confronted in Part II of the Field Consultant Opinion Questionnaire with sixteen problems encountered by one or more consultants. The responses by all the consultants to questions in Part II of the questionnaire are given in Table 28. They show that two-thirds or more had encountered ten of the problems, but only a third had experienced any conflict with other schools' personnel. Experiences of mistrust by teachers and of an imbalance in consultative duties, were recorded by a minority in the group.



Table 28

## Group Opinion on Problems Encountered by Field Consultants

Question No. on the Field Consultant Questionnaire	Problem	No. of Field Consultants "encountering" the problem
		N=9
36	Insufficient time to accomplish duties	9
35	Inadequacy of work facilities	9
47	Principals not familiar with field consultant's function	9
37	Insufficient clerical assistance	8
38	Experience a role conflict	8
45	Teachers too generalist in their approach	7
44	Coordinators not trained for the whole area of their responsibility	7
40	Disadvantages to the field consultant's own classroom students	6
39	Inflexibility of timetabling for teaching/consultative work	6
48	Insufficient authority to perform all duties adequately	6
46	An imbalance of duties - too much inservice	5
43	Mistrust of field consultants by teachers	4
41	Conflict with principal in resident school	3
42	Conflict over use of resident school facilities	3
49	School administrators impeding endeavours	3
50	Conflict with coordinators	None



### Improvements Necessary to Increase Effectiveness

Following the questions to consultants on problems encountered in Part II of the Field Consultant Opinion Questionnaire, they were requested in Part II to record their opinions on fourteen suggested improvements that may increase the effectiveness of their role. Table 29 shows that seven or more of the field consultants considered twelve of the suggested improvements were necessary, with opinion divided on the other two.

Except for some reservations by central office respondents on field consultant involvement in decision-making at central office, group consensus on suggested improvements was the same for field consultants and central office personnel.



Table 29

Improvements Suggested by Field Consultants  
To Increase Their Effectiveness

Question No. on the Field Consultant Questionnaire	Improvement	No. of Field Consultants "suggesting" the improvement N=9
51	More attention by central office to placement of field consultants	9
53	Administrators should be better informed about field consultant's function	9
57	Larger allocation of time for consultative work	9
52	Better selection of teachers co-operating with field consultants in the resident school	9
58	More flexible timetabling of field consultant teaching duties	9
63	More say in the placement of field consultants	9
56	More opportunity for consultants to meet together	8
54	Make more teachers aware that field consultants are not evaluators	8
62	More say in the selection of texts/ specialist materials	8
55	Develop specialist interests of teachers	8
61	More say in curriculum changes and programming	7
64	More involvement with central office on matters pertaining to the work of coordinators	7
59	More specific allotments of time to coordinators	4
60	More opportunity to build "lighthouse" classrooms	4



### Career Satisfaction and Monetary Allowances

The responses of field consultants to two of the three questions in Part IV of the Field Consultant Opinion Questionnaire are given in Chapter 3, Table 15. The majority (7) of the consultants, like all other respondents in the schools, considered the position of field consultant could constitute a life-time career to the accomplished teacher, but surprisingly only one consultant expressed a preference for the consultative position over a principalship, assuming equal remuneration with each position.

In answer to the third question on Part IV of the questionnaire, only two consultants regarded the additional financial benefits from the consultative position were adequate.

### SUMMARY

Intra-group consensus of field consultants on 25 consultative functions, was higher than the inter-group consensus of five respondent groups on the same functions, established earlier in Chapter 3. The majority of consultants had encountered similar problems, but only a minority had experienced conflict situations involving other in-school personnel.

Field consultants, like central office personnel, were generally agreed on a number of specific improvements that could improve the effectiveness of consultative services to teachers.

Most field consultants see the career potential in their



newly established role, but, with one exception, if given a choice would prefer a principalship.



## Chapter 7

### SUMMARY AND FINDINGS, AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents a restatement of the problem, a summary of the findings on the thirteen sub-problems and some conclusions on (1) the composite expectations that make up the "role of the field consultant" (2) the overall value of the recently established position of the field consultant to the whole elementary urban school district, and (3) the improvements necessary to solve the more serious problems encountered by field consultants.

#### RESTATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The major problem was the following:

To ascertain the opinions of teachers, coordinators, field consultants, principals and central office staff regarding the professional assistance which field consultants are expected to provide in helping teachers to improve their classroom instruction.

#### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This study sought to answer thirteen sub-problems posed at the beginning of the research. The data used to answer the sub-problem were supplied by teachers, coordinators, field



consultants, principals and central office staff. A brief summary of the major findings on the sub-problems follows.

Sub-problem One - To what extent are teachers and other alter groups familiar with the consultative functions of the field consultant?

1. Total noncommittal responses from all five groups of respondents showed a mean of less than 11%.
2. Teachers showed the highest hesitancy of opinion or lack of understanding on all the various consultative functions considered. Three times the percentage of null responses are recorded by teachers compared to the combined percentage of all other respondent groups.
3. Only 50% of all elementary teachers expressed an "awareness" of the field consultant's function.
4. 84% of coordinators indicated an "awareness" of the field consultant's function.
5. The figures of 14% for all elementary teachers and 4% for all coordinators anticipating they will not require any consultative assistance in the classroom had not changed following the introduction of field consultants into the system.
6. 78% of the principals indicated they were familiar with the services provided by field consultants.
7. Only 16 neutral central office opinions on the consultative functions were recorded out of a total of 248.



Sub-problem Two - What consensus is there between all five respondent groups concerning the functions of the field consultant?

Consensus between all respondent groups was indicated on 25 consultative functions.

At the 70% level of agreement or over on functions:

1. Providing in-service work for teachers.
2. Helping in the professional development of teachers.
3. Showing concern for the immediate needs of teachers.
4. Helping with curriculum development at the teacher level.
5. Helping with overall curriculum development.
6. Reviewing specialist subject literature.
7. Informing teachers of consultative services.
8. Advising central office of teacher needs.
9. Providing liaison between different schools.
10. Speaking at staff meetings on common school problems.
11. Giving demonstration lessons to individual teachers.
12. Giving demonstration lessons to groups of teachers.
13. Advising teachers on the source/use of classroom aids.
14. Establishing personal contacts with teachers.
15. Encouraging teachers to bring new ideas into the classroom.
16. Visiting classrooms to discuss teacher needs.
17. Employing non-directive counselling to solve teacher problems.
18. Giving consideration to teacher recommendations.



19. Visiting teachers at least twice a year.
20. Visiting teachers at regular intervals.
21. Assisting teachers in any class.

At the 65% level of agreement or over on functions:

22. Preparing a "model learning" environment.
23. Being a practising teacher.
24. Spending the majority of consultative duty time with individual teachers.
25. Conducting pre-school conferences.

Sub-problem Three - What are the differences in expectations of field consultants between the different alter groups?

1. Less consensus shown on the functions of field consultants that overlap the duties of a consultative nature carried out by principals or coordinators, e.g. the induction of beginning teachers by field consultants.
2. Considerable variation of opinion existed in all groups on functions that put the consultative services on a routine basis, e.g. the visitation of teachers a minimum of twice annually by field consultants.
3. The majority of coordinators considered field consultants have a liaison role in relation to their own, e.g. the directing of the activities of coordinators by field consultants.
4. School and central office administrators tended to be wary of any field consultant function that may interject between established role relationships, e.g. visiting all teachers at regular intervals throughout the year.



Sub-problem Four - What consultative services do field consultants consider they should provide?

1. A higher level of agreement existed between field consultants on the same 25 consultative functions on which there was consensus between all the respondent groups.
2. Sharp disagreement existed within the consultant group on two functions showing overall consensus, namely, the regularity of their teaching duties and time spent with individual teachers.

Sub-problem Five - Are there any apparent overall differences in the responses of all respondents on the bases of age and experience?

1. A lack of disparity occurred between responses from different age and experience categories.
2. Out of all the consultative functions considered, opinions varied on only six functions between the five age sub-groups, and on only four functions between the six experience sub-groups.

Sub-problem Six - Are there significant differences in the responses given by teachers categorised on these bases?

- (a) teaching level
- (b) years of training
- (c) number of subjects taught
- (d) sex of teacher
- (e) "generalist" or "specialist"

1. Few differences in teacher responses occurred between the four training sub-groups. Three-year trained teachers showed the highest differences in neutral and positive responses.



2. Few differences in opinion were related to grade level taught. Some differences of opinion occurred between overall teacher consensus and the opportunity room and the grades 1-2 sub-group.
3. Out of the six teacher sub-groups, with different numbers of "subjects taught", only the sub-group of teachers with the highest number (7) of subjects to teach showed any apparent differences with overall teacher consensus. Their differing responses tended to suggest less field consultant involvement in group work with teachers and more non-direct counselling with individual teachers.
4. No significant differences of opinion between the two sexes could be determined.
5. The teachers who regarded themselves as "specialists" indicated no significant differences of opinion to their "generalist" colleagues.

Sub-problem Seven - What kind of co-operation is expected and experienced between coordinators and field consultants?

1. 79% of coordinators had obtained assistance from field consultants by direct contact compared with 21% through an administrator.
2. Coordinators viewed the consultant's role as basically one of liaison between all in-school or central office personnel.
3. 75% of coordinators supported the idea of consultants directing coordinators.



4. Coordinators did not generally support differentiation between functions of their role and the consultant's in the classroom.

Sub-problem Eight - What kind of co-operation is expected and experienced between principals and field consultants?

1. The principals considered the services provided by field consultants were generally quite satisfactory.
2. Good understanding and very few conflicts were recorded between consultants and principals.
3. Principals were wary of some field consultant functions that tended to interject in their role relationships with teachers and central office.

Sub-problem Nine - What are the problems encountered by field consultants in their new role?

1. The inadequacy of work facilities for the field consultant.
2. The allocation of time for consultative work.
3. The unsatisfactory classroom situation for the consultant in the resident school.
4. The absence of a clear directive to a high proportion of school personnel on the functions of the field consultant, especially with respect to the teachers.

Sub-problem Ten - What improvements are necessary in the elementary school system to improve the effectiveness of the field consultant?

1. More attention by central office to placement of field consultants.



2. Increased allocation of time for consultative work.
3. Better selection of teachers co-operating in the classroom with field consultants in the resident school.
4. More flexible timetabling of the field consultant teaching duties.
5. More involvement in decision-making for field consultants regarding their placement in the schools.
6. More opportunity for consultants to meet together.
7. More say for field consultants in the selection of texts/specialist materials.
8. More involvement in decision-making for field consultants regarding curriculum changes and programming
9. More involvement with central office on matters pertaining to the work of coordinators.

Sub-problem Eleven - How does central office view the effectiveness of the consultative services provided by field consultants at the elementary level?

1. The indispensability of the field consultant's counsel in developing educational policies at the elementary level.
2. The improvement in the quality in programs.
3. Better all round communication to and from teachers.
4. Better use of resource materials by teachers.
5. More purpose and direction to in-service work.
6. More enthusiasm shown by teachers.
7. Improvement and better use of classroom facilities.



Sub-problem Twelve - What are the career prospects of the field consultant position?

1. The majority of all groups agreed that consultation could form a career position for teachers and principals are the most strongly in favour.
2. Only one consultant expressed a preference for the consultative position over a principalship.

Sub-problem Thirteen - What specific criteria are used in selecting field consultants?

1. No specific selection criteria indicated by central office.
2. Two consultants had a master's degree in a subject area relevant to their consultative work.
3. Enthusiasm, apparent teaching competence and an exceedingly approachable manner were observed in all nine field consultants.

## CONCLUSIONS

### The Role of the Field Consultant

With reference to the above summaries and results showing consensus between all respondent groups, the role of the field consultant could be outlined as follows:

Overall, the role of the field consultant is to help teachers with classroom problems, and to maintain by in-service education a high standard of professional knowledge and competence in teachers.

More specifically this will include:

As practising teachers advising, but not evaluating colleagues



individually or in groups

- Give consideration to any teacher recommendation
- Visit classrooms to discuss teacher needs
- Inform all school personnel of the consultative services and facilities available to them
- Advise teachers on classroom aids
- Give demonstration lessons to teachers
- Be "on call" to every elementary teacher
- Establish personal contacts with teachers
- Employ non-directive counselling to help teachers
- Speak at staff meetings on common school problems

Helping "to provide" the contributive conditions in the classroom for the in-service development of teachers

- Carry out in-service work with teachers
- Assist in implementing new programs
- Be involved in overall curriculum development and aware of current trends
- Help teachers in professional development by such means as teacher intervisitations and group involvement
- Encourage teachers to experiment with new methods

Coordinating an instructional program in specific subject areas or at specific grade levels

- Liaise between different schools
- Liaise between coordinators or "zones"
- Advise central office of teachers needs and program deficiencies



Ensuring that proper and adequate instructional materials are available to all teachers throughout the whole system

- Advise teachers on classroom aids
- Visit classrooms to discuss teacher needs
- Advise central office of teacher needs

Showing "leadership" in the classroom situation

- Speak at staff meetings on common school problems
- Encourage teachers to voice opinions on curriculum changes
- Organise in-service activities around problems which are considered important by teachers
- Help teachers to appraise the effectiveness of their work
- Prepare a "model learning" environment in appropriate situations

The Overall Value of the Field Consultant to the Urban Elementary School District

1. Central office consultative assistance is further decentralised.
2. The availability of consultative assistance at the elementary level is put more on a par with similar assistance to high school teachers provided by head of departments and other consultative personnel - without "departmentalising".
3. The field consultant can assess the "classroom needs" of the whole system and direct resources where they are most needed.
4. The field consultant can give "first hand" accounts to central office for the whole system.
5. The field consultant can provide an overview for central office of the consultative services, especially in regard to



the work of coordinators.

6. The field consultant can help to counteract the often adverse parochial interests of coordinators (Heron 1969:130), as well as being able to serve teachers in a more specialist advisory capacity.
7. The field consultant is able to liaise between all personnel providing consultative assistance, and at the same time maintain a "viable" relationship with teachers by being a practising teacher.

#### The Improvements Necessary to Solve the More Immediate Problems Encountered by Field Consultants

1. Relocate two consultants in the same or related subject areas in the same school to "share" the consultative duties and teaching responsibilities of a "model" classroom.
2. Provide the two consultants with their own office or separate working area as well as easy access to a telephone and other facilities so that records can be kept, visual aids stored, consultations held etc.
3. Improvements 1 and 2, and others previously stated, may be more easily achieved, and the presence of two consultants in one school "less disturbing" for the school administrator, if the field consultants were located in four or five of the larger schools with 20 or more teachers.
4. Ensure that all personnel in the schools, especially teachers, are aware of all the consultative services available.



## SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The range of positions associated in some way with the consultation function includes department heads, subject coordinators, field consultants, principals, specialist supervisors and others. The involvement of such varied positions in the consultation function is an indication of the complexity and the difficulty of maintaining a distinction between it and other supervisory functions.

Further delineation of the consultative function may be best achieved by focusing further research directly upon consultants. Growing opportunities for research of this kind can be found in Alberta and elsewhere in Canada. For example an analysis could be undertaken of the role of the recently appointed regional consultants in Alberta, as perceived by provincial administrators, superintendents, principals and other in-school staff.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andrews, J.H.M. "Who Shall Supervise?" A paper presented to the Canadian Education Association, Banff, Alberta. May, 1960.
- Blessing, K. "The Role of the Resource Consultant in Special Education," The Council for Exceptional Children. Washington D.C: 1968.
- Burnham, R.M., and M.L. King, "Supervision in Action," Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, N.E.A. Washington, D.C: September, 1961.
- Corwin, R.G. "Professional Persons in Public Organizations," Educational Administration Quarterly, X (Autumn, 1965), 73-75.
- Enns, F. "Supervision: A Rationale," The Canadian Administrator. II:7 (April, 1963), 27-30.
- Enns, F. Supervision of Instruction: A Conceptual Framework, Canadian Education and Research Digest. IX (September, 1968), 283-297.
- Enns, F. "The Supervisor and: His Function," The C.S.A. Bulletin. VII:4 (April, 1968), 3-21.
- Ferneau, E. "Which Consultant," Administrator's Notebook. II:8 (April, 1954), 8-11.
- Finlay, J. "Field Services," Edmonton Public Schools Circular, 1970.
- Freeze, C.R. "On Becoming an Open Supervisor," The High School Journal. LIII:6 (March, 1970), 354-361.
- Frymier, J.R. "The Supervisor and His Professional Identity," The Supervisor: New Dimensions. 1965. 83-102.
- Gross, N., W.S. Mason, and W.A. McEachern, Exploration in Role Analysis. New York: J. Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1966.
- Harris, B.M. Supervisory Behavior in Education. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1963.
- Harrison, R.E. "An Analysis of the Weekly Workload of Nova Scotia High School Principals." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Alberta, 1965.
- Heron, R.P. "Innovativeness, School Climate and Coordinators." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Alberta, 1969.



- Hewko, W.M., "An Analysis of the Role of the Junior High School Coordinator." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Alberta, 1965.
- Lucio, W.H., and J.D. McNeil, Supervision. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.
- MacKay, D.A. "Canadian Supervisory Practices," The Canadian Administrator. VIII:3 (December, 1969), 9-13.
- MacKay, D.A. "An Analysis of Supervisory Functions." A paper presented to the Canadian Education Association, Banff, Alberta. May, 1971.
- Neagley, R.L., and D.H. Evans, Handbook for Effective Supervision and Instruction. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Owens, R.G. Organizational Behavior in Schools. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Sarbin, T.R. "Role Theory," Handbook of Social Psychology. 1954. 225-228.
- Simpkins, W.S., and D. Friesen. "Teacher Participation in School Decision-Making," The Canadian Administrator. VIII:4 (January, 1969), 13-19.
- Spears, H. Improving the Supervision of Instruction. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.
- Toews, R.H. "Expectations for the Role of the Principal." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Alberta, 1970.



## APPENDIX A

### Outline of Instrument for Structured Interviews with Elementary Field Consultants



## INTERVIEW REPORT ON FIELD CONSULTANT

### Biographical Data

1. Present position:

Teaching more than half-time

☐

Teaching half-time

☐

2. Sex:

Male

☐

Female

☐

3. Total number of schools using the consultative services:

10 - 30 schools

☐

31 - 50 schools

☐

51 - 70 schools

☐

71 -100 schools

☐

4. Total number of teachers that can call on the services:

25 - 50 teachers

☐

51 - 100 teachers

☐

101 - 150 teachers

☐

more than 150 teachers

☐

5. Grade levels covered by the duties of the field consultant:

Grades 1 and 2

☐

Grades 3 and 4

☐

Grades 5 and 6

☐

Opportunity Grades

☐

6. The subject areas covered by the duties as a field consultant:

Art

☐

Language Arts - Reading

☐

Early Childhood

☐

Mathematics

☐

Science

☐

Social Studies

☐



### Suggested Duties

In your opinion do you consider the following are an important function of the field consultant role?

	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not important
1. To visit all teachers in their zone at least twice a year or as the need arises and time permits				
2. To help teachers diagnose their own teaching difficulties by <u>non-directive</u> counselling.				
3. To help teachers find a solution to their problems by <u>directive</u> counselling				
4. To provide individual assistance for newly appointed teachers				
5. To acknowledge and give due consideration to any teacher recommendation				
6. To disseminate new materials and methods in your own subject area				
7. To interpret School District curriculum trends and educational policy				
8. To advise central office or principals to staff needs				
9. To encourage creativity and experimentation in the classroom				
10. To assist teachers in planning, organizing and conducting workshops on problems arising out of their daily work				



### Actual Duties

Describe the specific tasks or duties performed by you since the beginning of the school year, which have been assigned to you or initiated by you because of your designated position as a field consultant:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

### Opinions Relating to the Position of the Elementary Field Consultant

1. Expectations of other schools' personnel.
  - (a) Central Office
  - (b) Principals
  - (c) Teachers
2. Problems encountered when attempting to assist elementary teachers.
3. Improvements, if any, that could be made in the elementary school system to make the field consultant more effective.
4. Liaison with coordinators.



## APPENDIX B

### Instruments for Collecting Data





January 29, 1971

Dear Principal:

Dr. H. Mosychuk has informed you that we are collaborating with Mr. Henry Ward, Director of Staff Development, in a study, sponsored by the Service Research Branch, of the new position of Field Consultant in the E.P.S.D.

While the presence of nine elementary field consultants has become an established fact within the last twelve months, their role has not yet been thoroughly evaluated. A significant question seems to be to what extent the position of field consultant, with the primary function of helping teachers with classroom problems, is making a significant contribution to the overall efficiency of the total elementary school organization.

Questionnaires are being forwarded to principals, coordinators, teachers and field consultants, and interviews will be conducted with some central office personnel. We would very much appreciate your cooperation in obtaining completed questionnaires from the following staff in your school by carrying out these instructions.

1. Distribute the enclosed questionnaires to your staff:  
(a) Principal 1, (b) Coordinators ....., (c) Teachers (who are not Coordinators or Field Consultants .....
2. As soon as possible, collect the completed questionnaires sealed in the enclosed envelopes.
3. Mail all questionnaires in the large stamped, addressed envelope to the above address.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated.



CODE:

Individual replies are held  
in strict confidence

## TEACHER OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta

### Purpose of the Questionnaire

On the following pages are a few questions requesting some personal data, but mainly the questions refer to your views and experiences of the consultative services provided by the nine elementary field consultants, whose primary function is helping teachers with any classroom problems.

From interviews and questionnaires sent to a representative number of teaching and administrative personnel throughout the elementary schools in the E.P.S.D., it is hoped to assess the value and sufficiency of the services provided by field consultants since the beginning of the school year 1970-71.

### General instructions

1. Take as much time to answer each question as you wish.
2. Please answer each question.
3. On completion place in the addressed envelope provided and seal.
4. Return the sealed envelope to your principal, who will mail it directly to the University.

Your co-operation is very much appreciated.

THANK YOU

W. Cowle.



## PART I

Personal Data

Please answer each item as it applies to you in your present teaching position by placing a check mark (✓) in the space provided.

1. Teaching level

- ☐ kindergarten  
☐ Opportunity Room  
☐ Grade 1  
☐ Grade 2  
☐ Grade 3  
☐ Grade 4  
☐ Grade 5  
☐ Grade 6

2. Subjects taught

- ☐ Art  
☐ Social  
☐ Modern language  
☐ Reading  
☐ Science  
☐ Mathematics  
☐ Music  
☐ Others (please specify)  
  
☐ generalist  
☐ specialist

4. Years of training

- ☐ 2 years or less  
☐ 3 years  
☐ 4 years or one degree  
☐ 5 years  
☐ 6 years or Master's degree

5. Sex

- ☐ Male  
☐ Female

3. Teaching experience

- ☐ less than 1 year  
☐ 1 year  
☐ 2 years  
☐ 3 years  
☐ 4 years  
☐ 5 years  
☐ 6 years  
☐ 7 years  
☐ 8 years  
☐ 9 years  
☐ 10 years  
☐ 11 years  
☐ 12 years  
☐ 13 years  
☐ 14 years  
☐ 15 years  
☐ 16 years  
☐ 17 years  
☐ 18 years  
☐ 19 years  
☐ 20 years  
☐ over 20 years

6. Age

- ☐ 20 - 25 years  
☐ 26 - 30 years  
☐ 31 - 40 years  
☐ 41 - 50 years  
☐ over 50 years



Consultative services

Check (✓) all responses which are appropriate.

7. Use of Consultative Services

- ☐ have obtained assistance from a coordinator by direct contact.
- ☐ have obtained assistance from a coordinator through a principal.
- ☐ have obtained assistance from a coordinator through a field consultant.
- ☐ have obtained assistance from a field consultant by direct contact.
- ☐ have obtained assistance from a field consultant through a principal.
- ☐ have obtained assistance from a field consultant through a coordinator.
- ☐ do not expect to ask for any assistance from a coordinator.
- ☐ do not expect to ask for any assistance from a field consultant.

8. Understanding of the field consultant function

- ☐ am not aware of the field consultants' function.
- ☐ that field consultants evaluate teacher performance in the classroom.
- ☐ that records of consultant evaluations of teachers are kept at central office of the E.P.S.B.



## PART II

The purpose of this part of the questionnaire is to discover what you think the role of the FIELD CONSULTANT ought to be.

CIRCLE one of the six letters (A, B, C, D, E, F) to show the answer you have selected.

WHAT IS YOUR OPINION THAT THE FIELD  
CONSULTANT OUGHT TO PERFORM THE  
FOLLOWING FUNCTIONS?

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Undecided	No opinion
1. Carry out in-service work for teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
2. Help in the professional development of teachers, especially in relation to their autonomy in the classroom.	A	B	C	D	E	F
3. Assist you in classes in which a new program is being implemented.	A	B	C	D	E	F
4. Be involved in curriculum development at the teacher level.	A	B	C	D	E	F
5. Be involved in overall curriculum development.	A	B	C	D	E	F
6. Prepare a "model learning" environment in their own classroom for observation by teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
7. Be of some assistance to every elementary teacher.	A	B	C	D	E	F
8. Prepare regularly a newsletter for elementary teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
9. Introduce and inform all teachers of the consultative services available.	A	B	C	D	E	F
10. Advise central office of teacher needs.	A	B	C	D	E	F
11. Liaise between different schools.	A	B	C	D	E	F
12. Speak at staff meetings on common school problems.	A	B	C	D	E	F



WHAT IS YOUR OPINION THAT THE FIELD  
CONSULTANT OUGHT TO PERFORM THE  
FOLLOWING FUNCTIONS?

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Undecided	No opinion
13. Assist you in all subject areas .	A	B	C	D	E	F
14. Give demonstration lessons to individual teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
15. Give demonstration lessons to groups of teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
16. Advise teachers on the source/use of classroom aids.	A	B	C	D	E	F
17. Establish personal contacts with teachers rather than a role relationship.	A	B	C	D	E	F
18. Be practising teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
19. Encourage teachers to experiment with new methods and ideas in their own classroom.	A	B	C	D	E	F
20. Visit you at your school at least twice a year.	A	B	C	D	E	F
21. Visit you at your school at regular intervals throughout the year.	A	B	C	D	E	F
22. Induct beginning teachers into a school.	A	B	C	D	E	F
23. Conduct pre-school teacher conferences at the beginning of the year.	A	B	C	D	E	F
24. Give general assistance to teachers in the classroom rather than help in a specialist subject area.	A	B	C	D	E	F
25. Visit you at your school only at your request.	A	B	C	D	E	F
26. Visit classrooms to assess program implementation.	A	B	C	D	E	F







## PART III

Career Prospects

Place a check mark (✓) opposite the answer appropriate to your reaction.

39. Do you feel that the position of field consultant could constitute a life-time career for some accomplished teacher who wishes to remain in close contact with teaching and students, rather than seek promotion by accepting administrative positions such as principal or in central office ?

- |                    |       |
|--------------------|-------|
| 1. Definitely yes: | _____ |
| 2. Probably yes:   | _____ |
| 3. Possibly yes:   | _____ |
| 4. No:             | _____ |
| 5. No opinion:     | _____ |
| 6. Undecided:      | _____ |

40. Would you prefer to have the position of field consultant rather than that of principal, assuming that you would receive the same salary for either position?

- |                    |       |
|--------------------|-------|
| 1. Definitely yes: | _____ |
| 2. Probably yes:   | _____ |
| 3. Possibly yes:   | _____ |
| 4. No:             | _____ |
| 5. No opinion:     | _____ |
| 6. Undecided:      | _____ |



CODE:

Individual replies are held  
in strict confidence

## COORDINATOR OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta

### Purpose of the Questionnaire

On the following pages are a few questions requesting some personal data, but, mainly the questions refer to your views and experiences of the consultative services provided by the nine elementary field consultants, whose primary function is helping teachers with any classroom problems.

From interviews and questionnaires sent to a representative number of teaching and administrative personnel throughout the elementary schools in the E.P.S.D., it is hoped to assess the value and sufficiency of the services provided by field consultants since the beginning of the school year 1970-71.

### General instructions

1. Take as much time to answer each question as you wish.
2. Please answer each question.
3. On completion place in the stamped addressed envelope provided and mail to the University.

Your co-operation is very much appreciated.

THANK YOU

W. Cowle.



## PART I

Personal Data

Please answer each item as it applies to you in your present teaching position by placing a check mark (✓).

1. Teaching level

- ☐ kindergarten  
☐ Opportunity Room  
☐ Grade 1  
☐ Grade 2  
☐ Grade 3  
☐ Grade 4  
☐ Grade 5  
☐ Grade 6

2. Subjects taught

- ☐ Art  
☐ Social  
☐ Modern language  
☐ Reading  
☐ Science  
☐ Mathematics  
☐ Music  
☐ Others (please specify)

3. Years of training

- ☐ 2 years or less  
☐ 3 years  
☐ 4 years or one degree  
☐ 5 years  
☐ 6 years or Master's degree

4. Sex

- ☐ Male  
☐ Female

5. Teaching Experience

- ☐ less than 1 year  
☐ 1 year  
☐ 2 years  
☐ 3 years  
☐ 4 years  
☐ 5 years  
☐ 6 years  
☐ 7 years  
☐ 8 years  
☐ 9 years  
☐ 10 years  
☐ 11 years  
☐ 12 years  
☐ 13 years  
☐ 14 years  
☐ 15 years  
☐ 16 years  
☐ 17 years  
☐ 18 years  
☐ 19 years  
☐ 20 years  
☐ over 20 years

6. Age

- ☐ 20 - 25 years  
☐ 26 - 30 years  
☐ 31 - 40 years  
☐ 41 - 50 years  
☐ over 50 years



Consultative services

Check (✓) all responses which are appropriate.

7. Use of Consultative Services

- ☐ have obtained assistance from a coordinator by direct contact.
- ☐ have obtained assistance from a coordinator through a principal.
- ☐ have obtained assistance from a coordinator through a field consultant.
- ☐ have obtained assistance from a field consultant by direct contact.
- ☐ have obtained assistance from a field consultant through a principal.
- ☐ have obtained assistance from a field consultant through a coordinator.
- ☐ do not expect to ask for any assistance from a coordinator.
- ☐ do not expect to ask for any assistance from a field consultant.

8. Understanding of the field consultant function.

- ☐ am not aware of the field consultants' function.
- ☐ that field consultants evaluate teacher performance in the classroom.
- ☐ that records of consultant evaluation of teachers are kept at central office of the E.P.S.B.



## PART II

The purpose of this part of the questionnaire is to discover what you think the role of the FIELD CONSULTANT ought to be.

CIRCLE one of the six letters (A, B, C, D, E, F) to show the answer you have selected.

WHAT IS YOUR OPINION THAT THE FIELD CONSULTANT  
OUGHT TO PERFORM THE FOLLOWING FUNCTIONS?

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Undecided	No opinion
1. Carry out in-service work (programming, conducting workshops etc.) for teachers, coordinators and administrators.	A	B	C	D	E	F
2. Help in the professional development of teachers, especially in relation to their autonomy in the classroom.	A	B	C	D	E	F
3. Be concerned about the immediate needs of teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
4. Be involved in curriculum development at the teacher level.	A	B	C	D	E	F
5. Be involved in overall curriculum development.	A	B	C	D	E	F
6. Prepare a "model learning" environment in their own classroom for observation by teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
7. Regularly review for elementary teachers, the educational and specialist subject literature.	A	B	C	D	E	F
8. Prepare regularly a newsletter for elementary teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
9. Inform all teachers of the consultative services available.	A	B	C	D	E	F



WHAT IS YOUR OPINION THAT THE FIELD CONSULTANT  
OUGHT TO PERFORM THE FOLLOWING FUNCTIONS?

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Undecided	No opinion
10. Advise central office of teacher needs.	A	B	C	D	E	F
11. Liaise between different schools.	A	B	C	D	E	F
12. Speak at staff meetings on common school problems.	A	B	C	D	E	F
13. Organize the work of coordinators.	A	B	C	D	E	F
14. Give demonstration lessons to individual teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
15. Give demonstration lessons to groups of teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
16. Advise teachers on the source/use of classroom aids.	A	B	C	D	E	F
17. Establish personal contacts with teachers rather than a role relationship.	A	B	C	D	E	F
18. Spend some regular proportion of their duty time teaching in their own classroom.	A	B	C	D	E	F
19. Encourage teachers to experiment with new methods and ideas in their own classrooms.	A	B	C	D	E	F
20. Spend at least 60% of their consultative time with individual teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
21. Spend at least 60% of their consultative time with small groups of teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
22. Induct beginning teachers into a school.	A	B	C	D	E	F
23. Conduct pre-school teacher conferences at the beginning of the year.	A	B	C	D	E	F



WHAT IS YOUR OPINION THAT THE FIELD CONSULTANT  
OUGHT TO PERFORM THE FOLLOWING FUNCTIONS?

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Undecided	No opinion
24. Give general assistance to teachers in the classroom rather than help in a specialist subject area.	A	B	C	D	E	F
25. Visit a classroom only at the invitation of the teacher.	A	B	C	D	E	F
26. Visit classrooms to assess program implementation.	A	B	C	D	E	F
27. Visit classrooms to discuss teacher needs.	A	B	C	D	E	F
28. Assist a teacher in solving disciplinary problems.	A	B	C	D	E	F
29. Employ non-directive counselling whenever possible to help the teacher diagnose his/her teaching difficulties.	A	B	C	D	E	F
30. Employ directive counselling when a teacher is unable to arrive at a solution to his/her own teaching problems.	A	B	C	D	E	F
31. Acknowledge and give due consideration to teachers' recommendations.	A	B	C	D	E	F
32. Visit a teacher at least twice a year.	A	B	C	D	E	F
33. Visit a teacher at regular intervals throughout the year.	A	B	C	D	E	F
34. Assist teachers in any class.	A	B	C	D	E	F
35. Assist teachers in all subject areas.	A	B	C	D	E	F
36. Be of some assistance to every elementary teacher.	A	B	C	D	E	F
37. Supplement the work of coordinators.	A	B	C	D	E	F







## PART III

Career prospects

Place a check mark (✓) opposite the answer appropriate to your reaction.

44. Do you feel that the position of field consultant could constitute a life-time career for some accomplished teacher who wishes to remain in close contact with teaching and students, rather than seek promotion by accepting administrative positions such as principal or in central office?

- |                    |       |
|--------------------|-------|
| 1. Definitely yes: | _____ |
| 2. Probably yes:   | _____ |
| 3. Possibly yes:   | _____ |
| 4. No:             | _____ |
| 5. No opinion:     | _____ |
| 6. Undecided:      | _____ |

45. Would you prefer to have the position of field consultant rather than that of principal, assuming that you would receive the same salary for either position?

- |                    |       |
|--------------------|-------|
| 1. Definitely yes: | _____ |
| 2. Probably yes:   | _____ |
| 3. Possibly yes:   | _____ |
| 4. No:             | _____ |
| 5. No opinion:     | _____ |
| 6. Undecided:      | _____ |



CODE:

Individual replies are held  
in strict confidence

## FIELD CONSULTANT OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta

### Purpose of the Questionnaire

On the following pages are questions drawn from recent interviews with all the elementary field consultants in the E.P.S.D. This is not in any way a test of consistency in expression of opinions, but rather an opportunity for you to consider all the items raised by yourself with those of all your colleagues.

### General Instructions

1. Take as much time to answer each question as you wish.
2. Please answer each question.
3. On completion place in the stamped addressed envelope provided and mail to the University.

Your extensive co-operation over the past weeks has been very much appreciated.

THANK YOU

W. Cowle







WHAT IS YOUR OPINION THAT THE FIELD  
CONSULTANT OUGHT TO PERFORM THE  
FOLLOWING FUNCTIONS?

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Undecided	No opinion
9. Inform all teachers of the consultative services available.	A	B	C	D	E	F
10. Advise central office of teacher needs.	A	B	C	D	E	F
11. Liaise between different schools.	A	B	C	D	E	F
12. Speak at staff meetings on common school problems.	A	B	C	D	E	F
13. Organize the work of coordinators.	A	B	C	D	E	F
14. Give demonstration lessons to individual teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
15. Give demonstration lessons to groups of teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
16. Advise teachers on sources and uses of classroom aids.	A	B	C	D	E	F
17. Establish personal contacts with teachers rather than a role relationship.	A	B	C	D	E	F
18. Spend some regular proportion of their duty time teaching in their own classroom.	A	B	C	D	E	F
19. Encourage teachers to experiment with new methods and ideas in their own classrooms.	A	B	C	D	E	F
20. Spend at least 60% of their consultative time with individual teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
21. Spend at least 60% of their consultative time with small groups of teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
22. Induct beginning teachers into a school.	A	B	C	D	E	F
23. Conduct pre-school teacher conferences at the beginning of the year.	A	B	C	D	E	F



WHAT IS YOUR OPINION THAT THE FIELD  
CONSULTANT OUGHT TO PERFORM THE  
FOLLOWING FUNCTIONS?

24. Give general assistance to teachers in the classroom rather than help in a specialist subject area.
25. Visit a classroom only at the invitation of the teacher.
26. Visit classrooms to assess program implementation.
27. Visit classrooms to discuss teacher needs.
28. Assist teachers in solving disciplinary problems.
29. Employ non-directive counselling whenever possible to help teachers diagnose their teaching difficulties.
30. Employ directive counselling when teachers are unable to arrive at a solution to their own teaching problems.
31. Acknowledge and give due consideration to teachers' recommendations.
32. Help lessen the workload of central office staff (e.g., principals could often be referred by central office staff to the consultant).
33. Liaise between central office and schools.
34. Explain central office policies to teachers and coordinators, e.g., from specialist committees, directives and programs of studies.

Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Undecided	No opinion
A	B	C	D	E	F
A	B	C	D	E	F
A	B	C	D	E	F
A	B	C	D	E	F
A	B	C	D	E	F
A	B	C	D	E	F
A	B	C	D	E	F
A	B	C	D	E	F
A	B	C	D	E	F

Space provided for further comments:







TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED THE  
 FOLLOWING PROBLEMS IN YOUR WORK AS A  
 FIELD CONSULTANT?

43. Mistrust of field consultants by teachers.
44. Coordinators not sufficiently trained for the whole area of their responsibility.
45. Teachers too generalist in their approach, and often inadequately prepared/trained in the specific subject area covered by a field consultant.
46. An imbalance of consultative duties - too much in-service work compared with classroom visitations or vice versa.
47. School principals not sufficiently familiar with your function.
48. Insufficient authority to perform all your duties adequately.
49. Opposition from administrators in the schools is serious enough to impede your endeavours.
50. Opposition from coordinators is serious enough to impede your endeavours.

Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Undecided	No opinion
A	B	C	D	E	F
A	B	C	D	E	F
A	B	C	D	E	F
A	B	C	D	E	F
A	B	C	D	E	F
A	B	C	D	E	F
A	B	C	D	E	F
A	B	C	D	E	F

Space provided for further comments:







HOW IMPORTANT DO YOU CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING IMPROVEMENTS ARE TO THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A FIELD CONSULTANT?

57.	Larger allocation of time for consultative work.	A	B	C	D	E	F
58.	More flexible timetabling of the field consultant's teaching duties.	A	B	C	D	E	F
59.	More specific allotments of time per subject to joint-subject coordinators.	A	B	C	D	E	F
60.	More opportunity to build "lighthouse" classrooms.	A	B	C	D	E	F
61.	More involvement in central office decision-making on curriculum changes and programming.	A	B	C	D	E	F
62.	More involvement in central office decision-making on selection of texts and specialist subject materials.	A	B	C	D	E	F
63.	More involvement in central office decision-making on the placement of field consultants.	A	B	C	D	E	F
64.	More involvement in central office decision-making on matters pertaining to the work of coordinators.	A	B	C	D	E	F

Space provided for further comments:



## PART IV

Career Satisfaction

Place a check mark (✓) under each question appropriate to your reaction.

65. Do you feel that the position of field consultant could constitute a life-time career for some accomplished teacher who wishes to remain in close contact with teaching and students, rather than seek promotion by accepting administrative positions such as principal or in central office?

1. Definitely yes: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Probably yes: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Possibly yes: \_\_\_\_\_
4. No: \_\_\_\_\_
5. No opinion: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Undecided: \_\_\_\_\_

66. Would you have preferred to have had the position of principal rather than of consultant, assuming that you would have received the same salary in either position?

1. Definitely yes: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Probably yes: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Possibly yes: \_\_\_\_\_
4. No: \_\_\_\_\_
5. No opinion: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Undecided: \_\_\_\_\_

67. Do you feel that the additional financial benefits for the duties of field consultant are adequate?

1. Yes: \_\_\_\_\_
2. No: \_\_\_\_\_



CODE:

Individual replies are held  
in strict confidence

## PRINCIPAL OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta

### Purpose of the Questionnaire

On the following pages are a few questions requesting some personal data, but mainly the questions refer to your views and experiences of the consultative services provided by the nine elementary field consultants, whose primary function is helping teachers with any classroom problems.

From interviews and questionnaires sent to a representative number of teaching and administrative personnel throughout the elementary schools in the E.P.S.D., it is hoped to assess the value and sufficiency of the services provided by field consultants since the beginning of the school year 1970-71.

### General instructions

1. Take as much time to answer each question as you wish.
2. Please answer each question.
3. On completion place in the stamped addressed envelope provided and mail to the University.

Your co-operation is very much appreciate.

THANK YOU

W. Cowle.



## PART I

### Personal Data

Please answer each item as it applies to you in your present administrative position by placing a check mark (✓) in the space provided.

1. Total number of years of teaching experience:

- ☐ less than 1 year
- ☐ 1 year
- ☐ 2 years
- ☐ 3 years
- ☐ 4 years
- ☐ 5 years
- ☐ 6 years
- ☐ 7 years
- ☐ 8 years
- ☐ 9 years
- ☐ 10 years
- ☐ 11 years
- ☐ 12 years
- ☐ 13 years
- ☐ 14 years
- ☐ 15 years
- ☐ 16 years
- ☐ 17 years
- ☐ 18 years
- ☐ 19 years
- ☐ 20 years
- ☐ over 20 years

2. How many years have you been a principal or vice-principal?

- ☐ less than 1 year
- ☐ 1 year
- ☐ 2 years
- ☐ 3 years
- ☐ 4 years
- ☐ 5 years
- ☐ 6 years
- ☐ 7 years
- ☐ 8 years
- ☐ 9 years
- ☐ 10 years
- ☐ 11 years
- ☐ 12 years
- ☐ 13 years
- ☐ 14 years
- ☐ 15 years
- ☐ 16 years
- ☐ 17 years
- ☐ 18 years
- ☐ 19 years
- ☐ 20 years
- ☐ over 20 years

3. Subjects taught (if any)

- ☐ Art
- ☐ Social
- ☐ Modern language
- ☐ Reading
- ☐ Science
- ☐ Mathematics
- ☐ Music
- ☐ Others (please specify):
- ☐ Generalist
- ☐ Specialist

4. Years of training

- ☐ 3 years
- ☐ 4 years or one degree
- ☐ 5 years
- ☐ 6 years or Master's degree

5. Age

- ☐ 25 - 30 years
- ☐ 31 - 40 years
- ☐ 41 - 50 years
- ☐ over 50 years

6. Sex

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female







WHAT IS YOUR OPINION THAT THE FIELD  
CONSULTANT OUGHT TO PERFORM THE  
FOLLOWING FUNCTIONS?

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Undecided	No opinion
10. Advise central office of teacher needs.	A	B	C	D	E	F
11. Liaise between different schools.	A	B	C	D	E	F
12. Speak at staff meetings on common school problems.	A	B	C	D	E	F
13. Organize the work of coordinators.	A	B	C	D	E	F
14. Give deomonstration lessons to individual teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
15. Give deomonstration lessons to groups of teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
16. Advise teachers on the source/use of classroom aids.	A	B	C	D	E	F
17. Establish personal contacts with teachers rather than a role relationship.	A	B	C	D	E	F
18. Spend some regular proportion of their duty time teaching in their own classrooms.	A	B	C	D	E	F
19. Encourage teachers to experiment with new methods and ideas in their own classrooms.	A	B	C	D	E	F
20. Spend at least 60% of their consultative time with individual teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
21. Spend at least 60% of their consultative time with small groups of teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
22. Induct beginning teachers into a school.	A	B	C	D	E	F
23. Conduct pre-school teacher conferences at the beginning of the year.	A	B	C	D	E	F



WHAT IS YOUR OPINION THAT THE FIELD  
CONSULTANT OUGHT TO PERFORM THE  
FOLLOWING FUNCTIONS?

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Undecided	No opinion
24. Give general assistance to teachers in the classroom rather than help in a specialist subject area.	A	B	C	D	E	F
25. Visit a classroom only at the invitation of the teacher.	A	B	C	D	E	F
26. Visit classrooms to assess program implementation.	A	B	C	D	E	F
27. Visit classrooms to discuss teacher needs.	A	B	C	D	E	F
28. Assist a teacher in solving disciplinary problems.	A	B	C	D	E	F
29. Employ non-directive counselling whenever possible to help the teacher diagnose his/her teaching difficulties.	A	B	C	D	E	F
30. Employ directive counselling when a teacher is unable to arrive at a solution to his/her own teaching problems.	A	B	C	D	E	F
31. Acknowledge and give due consideration to teachers recommendations.	A	B	C	D	E	F
32. Help lessen the workload of central office staff (e.g., principals could often be referred by central office to the consultant).	A	B	C	D	E	F
33. Liaise between central office and schools.	A	B	C	D	E	F
34. Explain central office policies to teachers/ coordinators, e.g., from specialist committees, directives and programs of studies.	A	B	C	D	E	F
35. Advise principals of teacher needs.	A	B	C	D	E	F



WHAT IS YOUR OPINION THAT THE FIELD  
CONSULTANT OUGHT TO PERFORM THE  
FOLLOWING FUNCTIONS?

36. Have an initiating function in the  
introduction of new programs.
37. Have a supportive function in the  
introduction of new programs.

Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Undecided	No opinion
A	B	C	D	E	F
A	B	C	D	E	F



## PART III

This part of the questionnaire covers the co-operation between yourself and consultative personnel.

CIRCLE one of the five letters (A, B, C, D, E) to show the answer you have selected.

	Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
38. How frequently do field consultants respond promptly to calls for assistance from teachers?	A	B	C	D	E
39. Are the services of a field consultant sought at the request of a teacher?	A	B	C	D	E
40. Are the services of a field consultant sought without the teacher's knowledge?	A	B	C	D	E
41. How frequently do field consultants by-pass formal communication channels?	A	B	C	D	E
42. Is there an overlap between the functions of coordinators and field consultants?	A	B	C	D	E
43. How frequently do conflicts arise between yourself and field consultants?	A	B	C	D	E
44. How frequently do coordinators give satisfactory assistance to teachers?	A	B	C	D	E
45. How frequently do consultants supplement the work of coordinators?	A	B	C	D	E
46. How frequently do field consultants liaison between coordinators and principals?	A	B	C	D	E
47. How frequently do field consultants give overall direction to the activities of coordinators?	A	B	C	D	E



## PART IV

This part of the questionnaire covers your understanding of the role of the field consultant.

Place a check mark (✓) opposite your answer.

48. Is the co-operation of the field consultants satisfactory? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
49. Are field consultants a threat to your formal authority in the school? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
50. Are you familiar with the services available from the field consultants in the different subject areas? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_



## PART V

Career Satisfaction

Place a check mark (✓) under each question appropriate to your reaction.

51. Do you feel that the position of field consultant could constitute a life-time career for some accomplished teacher who wishes to remain in close contact with teaching and students, rather than seek promotion by accepting administrative positions such as principal or in central office?

- |                    |       |
|--------------------|-------|
| 1. Definitely yes: | _____ |
| 2. Probably yes:   | _____ |
| 3. Possibly yes:   | _____ |
| 4. No:             | _____ |
| 5. No opinion:     | _____ |
| 6. Undecided:      | _____ |

52. Would you have preferred to have had the position of field consultant rather than of principal assuming that you would have received the same salary in either position?

- |                    |       |
|--------------------|-------|
| 1. Definitely yes: | _____ |
| 2. Probably yes:   | _____ |
| 3. Possibly yes:   | _____ |
| 4. No:             | _____ |
| 5. No opinion:     | _____ |
| 6. Undecided:      | _____ |



CODE:

Individual replies are held  
in strict confidence

CENTRAL OFFICE OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

AND

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW REPORT

Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta

Purpose of Questionnaire/Interview

On the following pages are a few questions requesting some personal data, but mainly the questions refer to your views and experiences of the consultative services provided by the nine elementary field consultants, whose primary function is helping teachers with any classroom problems.

From interviews and questionnaires sent to a representative number of teaching and administrative personnel throughout the elementary schools in the E.P.S.D., it is hoped to assess the value and sufficiency of the services provided by field consultants since the beginning of the school year 1970-71.

General instructions

1. Take as much time to answer each question as you wish.
2. Please answer each question.
3. On completion place in the stamped addressed envelope provided and mail to the University.

Your co-operation is very much appreciated.

THANK YOU

W. Cowle.







WHAT IS YOUR OPINION THAT THE FIELD  
CONSULTANT OUGHT TO PERFORM THE FOLLOWING  
FUNCTIONS?

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Undecided	No opinion
9. Inform all teachers of the consultative services available.	A	B	C	D	E	F
10. Advise central office of teacher needs.	A	B	C	D	E	F
11. Liaise between different schools.	A	B	C	D	E	F
12. Speak at staff meetings on common school problems.	A	B	C	D	E	F
13. Organize the work of coordinators.	A	B	C	D	E	F
14. Give demonstration lessons to individual teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
15. Give demonstration lessons to groups of teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
16. Advise teachers on the source/use of classroom aids.	A	B	C	D	E	F
17. Establish personal contacts with teachers rather than a role relationship.	A	B	C	D	E	F
18. Spend some regular proportion of their duty time teaching in their own classrooms.	A	B	C	D	E	F
19. Encourage teachers to experiment with new methods and ideas in their own classrooms.	A	B	C	D	E	F
20. Spend at least 60% of their consultative time with individual teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
21. Spend at least 60% of their consultative time with small groups of teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	F
22. Induct beginning teachers into a school	A	B	C	D	E	F







## PART II (Interview)

Opinions relating to suggested improvements to the field consultant's functioning.

1. What is your opinion on the following suggestions:
  - a. More attention by central office to the placement of field consultants in the schools in terms of adequate facilities, attitude of resident administrator, the teacher co-operating with the consultant in the teaching situation, availability of secretarial help, and "centralization" of the consultant.
  - b. School administrators should be better informed of the field consultant's function.
  - c. A change in attitude of teachers is necessary to make them aware that field consultants are not evaluators.
  - d. More opportunity should be given to teachers to develop specialist subject interests.
  - e. More opportunities should be provided for all field consultants to meet together, e.g., an "ideas fair".



- f. Larger allocation of time should be provided for consultative work by field consultants.
- g. More flexible timetabling should be introduced for field consultants.
- h. More specific allotments of time should be made per subject to joint subject co-ordinators.
- i. More opportunity should be provided for field consultants to build "lighthouse" classrooms.
- j. More involvement of field consultants in central office decision-making should take place.

- 2. In your opinion what contribution has the field consultant made to improving the overall efficiency of the total elementary school organization?
- 3. In your opinion what further improvements, if any, could be made to the services now provided by elementary field consultants?



4. In your opinion what specialised courses (in service or university), if any, could be introduced for co-ordinators or field consultants?
5. What do you feel prompted introduction of the position of field consultant?



## APPENDIX C

### School and Central Office Personnel Responses on the Functions of the Elementary Field Consultant



Table 30

Responses by School and Central Office Personnel on the Functions  
which Elementary Field Consultants can Perform

No.	Function <sup>a</sup>	Group	N	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	No Opinion or Undecided
1	Carry out in-service work (programming, conducting workshops etc.) for teachers, coordinators and administrators.	Principals	95	65%	26%	3%	3%	2%
		Teachers	132	46	39	5	2	8
		Coordinators	27	70	30	0	0	0
		Field Consultants	9	100	0	0	0	0
		Central Office	8	75	25	0	0	0
2	Help in the professional development of teachers, especially in relation to their autonomy in the classroom.	Principals	95	47	30	8	5	9
		Teachers	130	24	34	9	6	27
		Coordinators	27	37	44	15	4	0
		Field Consultants	9	67	22	11	0	0
		Central Office	7	57	43	0	0	0
3	Be concerned about the immediate needs of teachers	Principals	95	41	36	10	10	4
		Teachers	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Coordinators	27	44	26	22	7	0
		Field Consultants	9	67	22	11	0	0
		Central Office	7	43	29	29	0	0

<sup>a</sup> Questions found on each of the questionnaires for Field Consultants and the four alter groups (Appendix B).  
All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.



Table 30 (continued)

No.	Function <sup>a</sup>	Group	N	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	No Opinion or Undecided
4	Be involved in curriculum development at the teacher level	Principals	95	52%	43%	2%	2%	1%
		Teachers	130	32	44	7	6	12
		Coordinators	27	44	44	7	4	0
		Field Consultants	9	89	11	0	0	0
		Central Office	8	100	0	0	0	0
5	Be involved in overall curriculum development	Principals	95	36	43	14	3	4
		Teachers	131	24	41	11	5	18
		Coordinators	27	67	30	0	3	0
		Field Consultants	9	56	44	0	0	0
		Central Office	7	86	0	14	0	0
6	Prepare a "Model Learning" environment in their own classroom for observation by teachers	Principals	95	32	34	16	13	6
		Teachers	131	39	21	16	15	10
		Coordinators	27	26	26	22	22	4
		Field Consultants	9	11	11	33	44	0
		Central Office	8	12	25	25	25	13

<sup>a</sup> Questions found on each of the questionnaires for Field Consultants and the four alter groups (Appendix B).

All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.



Table 30 (continued)

No.	Function <sup>a</sup>	Group	N	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	No Opinion or Undecided
7	Regularly review for elementary teachers, the educational and specialist subject literature	Principals	95	17%	48%	19%	11%	5%
		Teachers	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Coordinators	27	33	52	15	0	0
		Field Consultants	9	22	56	11	11	0
		Central Office	8	25	63	0	0	12
8	Prepare regularly a newsletter for elementary teachers	Principals	95	6	34	27	14	19
		Teachers	131	9	26	15	24	26
		Coordinators	27	30	22	22	7	18
		Field Consultants	9	0	44	44	0	11
		Central Office	8	0	38	25	25	12
9	Inform all teachers of the consultative services available	Principals	95	51	31	12	5	2
		Teachers	131	63	29	1	2	5
		Coordinators	27	48	41	0	7	4
		Field Consultants	9	44	56	0	0	0
		Central Office	8	63	0	13	13	12

<sup>a</sup> Questions found on each of the questionnaires for Field Consultants and the four alter groups (Appendix B).

All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.



Table 30 (continued)

No.	Function <sup>a</sup>	Group	N	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	No Opinion or Undecided
10	Advise central office of teacher needs	Principals	95	30%	37%	12%	16%	6%
		Teachers	134	45	34	3	10	7
		Coordinators	27	41	41	4	11	4
		Field Consultants	9	67	11	22	0	0
		Central Office	8	88	0	0	0	12
11	Liaise between different schools	Principals	95	17	46	19	7	10
		Teachers	132	20	45	9	5	21
		Coordinators	27	22	44	7	11	15
		Field Consultants	9	22	56	22	0	0
		Central Office	8	38	38	13	0	12
12	Speak at staff meetings on common school problems	Principals	94	28	51	10	5	6
		Teachers	131	17	44	12	14	14
		Coordinators	27	37	33	11	7	11
		Field Consultants	9	56	44	0	0	0
		Central Office	8	25	25	25	12	12

<sup>a</sup> Questions found on each of the questionnaires for Field Consultants and the four alter groups (Appendix B).

All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.



Table 30 (continued)

No.	Function <sup>a</sup>	Group	N	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	No Opinion or Undecided
13	Organize the work of coordinators	Principals	95	17%	31%	16%	23%	14%
		Teachers	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Coordinators	27	26	30	11	22	11
		Field Consultants	9	22	22	33	0	22
		Central Office	8	0	13	25	50	12
14	Give demonstration lessons to individual teachers	Principals	95	36	35	13	16	1
		Teachers	130	28	38	15	10	9
		Coordinators	27	19	52	26	4	0
		Field Consultants	9	22	44	22	11	0
		Central Office	8	13	50	13	13	12
15	Give demonstration lessons to groups of teachers	Principals	95	34	48	8	4	5
		Teachers	131	25	53	11	5	6
		Coordinators	27	33	57	4	0	7
		Field Consultants	9	56	33	0	11	0
		Central Office	8	38	62	0	0	0

<sup>a</sup> Questions found on each of the questionnaires for Field Consultants and the four alter groups (Appendix B).

All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.



Table 30 (continued)

No.	Function <sup>a</sup>	Group	N	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	No Opinion or Undecided
16	Advise teachers on the source/use of classroom aids	Principals	95	57%	35%	1%	3%	4%
		Teachers	130	44	45	6	2	3
		Coordinators	27	44	52	4	0	0
		Field Consultants	9	56	33	11	0	0
		Central Office	8	100	0	0	0	0
17	Establish personal contacts with teachers rather than a role relationship	Principals	95	26	37	11	14	13
		Teachers	129	25	36	13	7	19
		Coordinators	27	30	33	22	7	7
		Field Consultants	9	78	22	0	0	0
		Central Office	8	25	38	0	13	25
18	Spend some regular proportion of their duty time teaching in their own classroom	Principals	95	31	21	16	18	15
		Teachers	130	40	22	15	5	18
		Coordinators	27	41	19	11	26	4
		Field Consultants	9	22	22	11	33	11
		Central Office	8	25	13	25	25	12

<sup>a</sup> Questions found on each of the questionnaires for Field Consultants and the four alter groups (Appendix B).

All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.



Table 30 (continued)

No.	Function <sup>a</sup>	Group	N	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	No Opinion or Undecided
19	Encourage teachers to experiment with new methods and ideas in their own classrooms	Principals	94	57%	37%	4%	0%	1%
		Teachers	131	50	40	4	2	5
		Coordinators	27	63	22	7	4	4
		Field Consultants	9	78	22	0	0	0
		Central Office	8	88	12	0	0	0
20	Spend at least 60% of their consultative time with individual teachers	Principals	95	40	35	8	13	4
		Teachers	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Coordinators	27	22	22	33	22	0
		Field Consultants	9	0	33	11	33	22
		Central Office	8	0	13	50	25	12
21	Spend at least 60% of their consultative time with small groups of teachers	Principals	95	12	43	29	7	10
		Teachers	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Coordinators	27	30	41	11	15	4
		Field Consultants	9	33	44	0	11	11
		Central Office	7	44	29	14	0	12

<sup>a</sup> Questions found on each of the questionnaires for Field Consultants and the four alter groups (Appendix B).

All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.



Table 30 (continued)

No.	Function <sup>a</sup>	Group	N	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	No Opinion or Undecided
22	Induct beginning teachers into a school	Principals	95	5%	23%	22%	42%	7%
		Teachers	130	28	26	11	16	20
		Coordinators	27	0	30	22	37	11
		Field Consultants	9	33	22	11	33	0
		Central Office	8	0	25	25	38	12
23	Conduct pre-school teacher conferences at the beginning of the year	Principals	95	16	41	15	13	16
		Teachers	130	10	36	12	20	23
		Coordinators	27	11	37	30	11	11
		Field Consultants	9	56	33	11	0	0
		Central Office	8	13	63	0	12	12
24	Give general assistance to teachers in the classroom rather than help in a specialist subject area	Principals	95	20	28	26	19	6
		Teachers	129	13	29	19	19	20
		Coordinators	27	4	30	26	41	0
		Field Consultants	9	22	11	33	33	0
		Central Office	8	13	13	25	50	0

<sup>a</sup> Questions found on each of the questionnaires for Field Consultants and the four alter groups (Appendix B).

All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.



Table 30 (continued)

No.	Function <sup>a</sup>	Group	N	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	No Opinion or Undecided
25	Visit a classroom only at the invitation of the teacher	Principals	95	19%	37%	28%	13%	3%
		Teachers	131	24	26	29	8	12
		Coordinators	27	11	37	33	11	7
		Field Consultants	9	0	56	33	11	0
		Central Office	8	0	38	25	38	0
26	Visit classrooms to assess program implementation	Principals	95	8	40	23	21	7
		Teachers	129	5	16	25	35	19
		Coordinators	27	19	22	30	19	11
		Field Consultants	9	33	44	11	11	0
		Central Office	8	63	25	12	0	0
27	Visit classrooms to discuss teacher needs	Principals	95	34	44	12	6	4
		Teachers	128	23	44	13	9	13
		Coordinators	27	48	37	4	4	0
		Field Consultants	9	67	22	11	0	0
		Central Office	8	63	37	0	0	0

<sup>a</sup> Questions found on each of the questionnaires for Field Consultants and the four alter groups (Appendix B).

All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.



Table 30 (continued)

No.	Function <sup>a</sup>	Group	N	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	No Opinion or Undecided
28	Assist a teacher in solving disciplinary problems	Principals	95	5%	28%	30%	35%	2%
		Teachers	130	7	22	22	39	11
		Coordinators	27	4	33	30	33	0
		Field Consultants	9	0	56	11	33	0
		Central Office	7	0	29	43	29	0
29	Employ non-directive counselling whenever possible to help the teacher diagnose his/her teaching difficulties	Principals	95	29	43	10	12	6
		Teachers	128	13	41	16	13	18
		Coordinators	27	22	48	11	7	11
		Field Consultants	9	78	22	0	0	0
		Central Office	7	43	29	0	14	14
30	Employ directive counselling when a teacher is unable to arrive at a solution to his/her own teaching problems	Principals	95	28	34	17	12	10
		Teachers	130	14	32	17	14	23
		Coordinators	27	26	48	4	11	11
		Field Consultants	9	44	44	6	11	0
		Central Office	7	14	29	43	14	0

<sup>a</sup> Questions found on each of the questionnaires for Field Consultants and the four alter groups (Appendix B).

All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.



Table 30 (continued)

No.	Function <sup>a</sup>	Group	N	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	No Opinion or Undecided
31	Acknowledge and give due consideration to teachers' recommendations	Principals	95	50%	44%	0%	2%	4%
		Teachers	130	39	47	2	4	8
		Coordinators	27	63	33	0	4	0
		Field Consultants	9	78	22	0	0	0
		Central Office	8	100	0	0	0	0
32	Help lessen the workload of central office staff	Principals	95	14	33	18	20	15
		Teachers	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Coordinators	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Field Consultants	9	33	44	11	11	0
		Central Office	8	25	38	12	12	12
33	Liaise between central office and schools	Principals	95	21	34	20	16	9
		Teachers	130	25	43	5	10	17
		Coordinators	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Field Consultants	9	44	56	0	0	0
		Central Office	8	38	38	13	13	0

<sup>a</sup> Questions found on each of the questionnaires for Field Consultants and the four alter groups (Appendix B).

All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.



Table 30 (continued)

No.	Function <sup>a</sup>	Group	N	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	No Opinion or Undecided
34	Explain central office policies to teachers and coordinators e.g. from specialist committees directives and programs of studies	Principals	95	22%	46%	14%	12%	6%
		Teachers	130	22	47	9	10	14
		Coordinators	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Field Consultants	9	44	44	11	0	0
		Central Office	8	38	38	0	12	12

<sup>a</sup> Questions found on each of the questionnaires for Field Consultants and the four alter groups (Appendix B).

All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.



APPENDIX D

SPECIMEN COMPUTER PRINT-OUT



## SPECIMEN COMPUTER PRINT-OUT

## STATUS CATEGORY BY VARIABLE Q.7. (Assist Every Elementary Teacher)

	Noncommital		Disagree		Agree			
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Teachers	8	6	12	15	48	41	130	
Coordinator	0	0	0	4	14	9	27	
Field Consultant	0	0	1	1	5	2	9	
Principals	2	3	10	18	46	16	95	
TOTAL	10	9	23	38	113	68	261	
TOT.%	3.8	3.4	8.8	14.6	43.3	26.1	100.0	CHI -
PERCENTAGE BY ROWS								SQUARE
Teachers	6.2	4.6	9.2	11.5	36.9	31.5	49.8	= 18.408
Coordinators	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.8	51.9	33.3	10.3	WITH
Field Consultants	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	55.6	22.2	3.4	15 D.F.
Principals	2.1	3.2	10.5	18.9	48.4	16.8	36.4	
PERCENTAGE BY COLUMNS								PROB. =
Teachers	80.0	66.7	52.2	39.5	42.5	60.3	49.8	0.241833
Coordinators	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	12.4	13.2	10.3	
Field consultants	0.0	0.0	4.3	2.6	4.4	2.9	3.4	PEARSON'S
Principals	20.0	33.3	43.5	47.4	40.7	23.5	36.4	CON.
PERCENTAGE BY TOTAL								COEFF.,
Teachers	3.1	2.3	4.6	5.7	18.4	15.7	49.8	C =
Coordinators	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	5.4	3.4	10.3	0.2567
Field Consultants	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4	1.9	0.8	3.4	
Principals	0.8	1.1	3.8	6.9	17.6	6.1	36.4	

## COLLAPSED DATA WITHOUT NONCOMMITAL RESPONSES

	Disagree		Agree			
	3	4	5	6		
Teachers	12	15	48	41	116	
Coordinators	0	4	14	9	27	
Field Consultants	1	1	5	2	9	
Principals	10	18	46	16	90	CHI -
TOTAL	23	38	113	68	242	SQUARE
TOT.%	9.5	15.7	46.7	28.1	100.0	= 12.08
PERCENTAGE BY ROWS						WITH
Teachers	10.5	12.9	41.4	35.3	47.9	9 D.F.
Coordinators	0.0	14.8	51.9	33.3	11.2	
Field Consultants	11.1	11.1	55.6	22.2	3.7	PROB. =
Principals	11.1	20.0	51.1	17.8	37.2	0.212299
PERCENTAGE BY COLUMNS						PEARSON'S
Teachers	52.2	39.5	42.5	60.3	47.9	CON.
Coordinators	0.0	10.5	12.4	13.2	11.1	
Field Consultants	4.3	2.6	4.4	2.9	3.7	COEFF.,
Principals	43.5	47.4	40.7	23.5	37.2	C=0.2175
PERCENTAGE BY TOTAL						
Teachers	5.0	6.2	19.8	16.9	47.9	
Coordinators	0.0	1.7	5.8	3.7	11.2	
Field Consultants	0.4	0.4	2.1	0.8	3.7	
Principals	4.1	7.4	19.0	6.6	37.2	





**B29989**